arXiv:1504.03458v9 [math.RT] 15 Dec 2016

ON A UNIQUENESS PROPERTY OF CUSPIDAL UNIPOTENT REPRESENTATIONS

YONGQI FENG AND ERIC OPDAM

Abstract. The formal degree of a unipotent discrete series character of an absolutely almost simple group over a nonarchimedean local field which splits over an unramified extension, is a rational function of the cardinality $\mathbf{q}$ of the residue field, whose poles and zeroes (apart from $\mathbf{q} = 0$) are roots of unity. We prove that the formal degree of a *cuspidal* unipotent representation (in the sense of Lusztig [Lus1, Lus2]) determines its Kazhdan-Lusztig-Langlands parameter, up to twisting by weakly unramified characters. For split exceptional groups this result follows from the work of M. Reeder [R2], and for the remaining exceptional cases this was verified in [Fe1]. In the present paper we treat the classical families.

A cuspidal unipotent formal degree, normalized appropriately, is the reciprocal of a polynomial. For orthogonal and symplectic groups the zeroes of this polynomial are roots of unity of *even* order. We show that this property is very distinctive among unipotent formal degrees of general discrete series characters, and we show that if a unipotent formal degree has poles or zeroes of odd order, then the root of unity with the largest odd order that occurs in this way *is a zero* of the formal degree.

The main result of this article characterizes unramified Kazhdan-Lusztig-Langlands parameters which support a cuspidal local system in terms of formal degrees. The result implies the uniqueness of so-called cuspidal spectral transfer maps (as introduced in [Op2]) between unipotent affine Hecke algebras (up to twisting by unramified characters). In [Op3] the essential uniqueness of arbitrary unipotent spectral transfer maps was reduced to the cuspidal case.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Inner forms 2
1.2. The relative root datum 4
1.3. Unipotent types 4
1.4. The group of weakly unramified characters 5
1.5. The action of Ω^{θ}_{ad} on $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{u}}(G,u)$ 6
1.6. Cuspidal unipotent representations 8
1.7. Discrete unramified Langlands parameters 9
1.8. Formal degrees, residues of μ-functions, and adjoint gamma factors 10

Date: Friday 16^{th} December, 2016.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20C08; Secondary 22D25, 43A30.

Key words and phrases. Cuspidal unipotent representation, formal degree, unramified Langlands parameter.

This research was supported by ERC–advanced grant no. 268105. It is a pleasure to thank Mark Reeder for useful discussions and comments.

1.9. Statement of the main result 12
2. The μ-function and the Plancherel measure of $\mathcal{H}$ 14
3. Residue points as images of standard STMs 18
4. Description of the extra-special algorithms 24
5. The multiplicity of odd cyclotomic polynomials 28
5.1. Reduction to "real infinitesimal" central character 29
5.2. Reduction by standard STMs 31
5.3. Counting odd cyclotomic polynomials for the case $\delta = 1/2$ 33
5.4. Counting odd cyclotomic polynomial factors in the case $m \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4)_+$ 35
5.5. Reduction to certain rectangular diagrams 35
5.6. Counting odd cyclotomic polynomial factors for the cases $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ 45
6. Proof of the main theorem 47
6.1. Computing residues 47
6.2. Remarks on residues at residual points with positive coordinates 48
6.3. Residues at arbitrary residual points 50
6.4. Proof of the main Theorem for odd orthogonal groups 50
6.5. Proof of the main Theorem for unitary groups 53
6.6. Proof of the main Theorem for symplectic and even orthogonal groups 54
References 66

1. INTRODUCTION

Let k be a non-archimedean local field with finite residue field $\mathbf{F_q}$ of characteristic $\mathbf{p}$. Fix a separable closure k^s of k. Let $K \subset k^s$ be the maximal unramified extension of k. The residue field $\mathbf{F}$ of K is an algebraic closure of $\mathbf{F_q}$. There are isomorphisms of Galois groups $\mathrm{Gal}(K/k) \simeq \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbf{F}/\mathbf{F_q}) \simeq \hat{\mathbf{Z}}$, and we may choose as topological generator the *geometric Frobenius element* Frob, whose *inverse* induces the automorphism $x \mapsto x^{\mathbf{q}}$ for any $x \in \mathbf{F}$. Let $I_k = \mathrm{Gal}(k^s/K)$ be the inertia subgroup of $\mathrm{Gal}(k^s/k)$ and let W_k be the Weil group of k.

1.1. **Inner forms.** Let $\mathbf{G}$ be any connected reductive group over k, with maximal k-torus $\mathbf{S}$ and Borel subgroup $\mathbf{B} \supset \mathbf{S}$. *We will, admittedly unconventionally, denote by* Σ *the based root datum of the identity component of the dual L-group* ${}^LG$ *(see below). Hence* $\Sigma^\vee = (X_*, \Sigma_0^\vee, \Delta_0^\vee, X^*, \Sigma_0, \Delta)$ *denotes the based root datum of* $\mathbf{S} \subset \mathbf{B} \subset \mathbf{G}$, *where* $X_* = X^*(\mathbf{S})$ *is the* character *lattice of* $\mathbf{S}$. Put $\Omega := X^*/Q(\Sigma_0)$. This is a finitely generated abelian group.

Choose a pinning for the root subgroups of the simple roots for $\mathbf{G}$. This induces a splitting of the canonical exact sequence

$$1 \to \mathrm{Int}(\mathbf{G}) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbf{G}) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\Sigma^\vee) \to 1.$$

The natural homomorphism $\gamma : \mathrm{Gal}(k^s/k) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbf{G})$ induces in this way an action $\gamma_{\mathrm{qs}} : \mathrm{Gal}(k^s/k) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbf{G})$ which is an inner twist of γ, and such that $\mathbf{B}$ is a k-subgroup with respect to γ_{qs}. In other words, we have defined a reductive group $\mathbf{G}_{\mathrm{qs}}$ over k which is *quasi-split* and which is an inner form of $\mathbf{G}$. Let $G^\vee$ be a complex reductive group, with Borel $B^\vee$ and maximal torus $S^\vee \subset B^\vee$, such that the based root datum Σ of

$S^\vee \subset B^\vee \subset G^\vee$ is dual to $\Sigma^\vee$. Choose a pinning for the root subgroups of the simple roots for $\mathbf{G}$ and $G^\vee$, inducing a splitting of the canonical exact sequence

$$1 \to \mathrm{Int}(G^\vee) \to \mathrm{Aut}(G^\vee) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\Sigma) \to 1$$

as well. We can identify the groups $\mathrm{Aut}(\Sigma)$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\Sigma^\vee)$ canonically, hence γ_{qs} gives rise to an algebraic action $\gamma^\vee$ of $\mathrm{Gal}(k^s/k)$ on $G^\vee$. Choose $\mathrm{Gal}(k^s/k) \to \Gamma \to 1$, a finite quotient through which $\gamma^\vee$ factors. We set ${}^LG := G^\vee \rtimes \Gamma$ (of course, the relevant notions in the theory do not depend on this choice of a finite form of ${}^LG$).

Definition 1.1. *For $\mathbf{G}$ a connected reductive group over k, we denote by $\mathbf{G}_{\mathrm{qs}}$ its quasi-split inner k-form constructed above. We write $G = \mathbf{G}(K)$ for the group of K-points. We will write $\mathbf{G}_{ad}$ for the adjoint quotient $\mathbf{G}_{ad} := \mathbf{G}/Z(\mathbf{G})$ of $\mathbf{G}$. If $\mathbf{G}$ is semisimple we will write $\mathbf{G}_{sc}$ for the group of simply connected type isogeneous to $\mathbf{G}$; in this semisimple case $\mathbf{G}_{sc}$ and $\mathbf{G}_{ad}$ are isogenous to $\mathbf{G}$.*

In what follows we shall *assume that $\mathbf{G}$ is a connected reductive k-group which splits over K*. This is equivalent to the assertion that $\mathbf{G}_{qs}$ *is unramified.* In this situation we can take $\Gamma = \langle\theta\rangle$, the finite group generated by the automorphism θ of $G^\vee$ by which Frob acts. We recall that the isomorphism classes of k-rational structures of $\mathbf{G}$ which are *inner forms* of G are parameterized by the cohomology set $H^1(k, \mathbf{G}_{ad})$. As a consequence of the Steinberg vanishing theorem (see e.g. [DeRe, Theorem 2.2.1]), all inner k-forms of G are K-split. If we denote by F the k-automorphism of G corresponding to the quasi-split action of Frob as constructed above, we have $H^1(k, \mathbf{G}_{ad}) = H^1(F, G_{ad})$ (where F acts on G_{ad} such that $\mathrm{Ad}(F.\alpha) := F \circ \mathrm{Ad}(\alpha) \circ F^{-1}$).

A cocycle $z \in Z^1(F, G_{ad})$ is completely determined by its image $u = z(F) \in G_{ad}$ of F, and its cohomology class $[z] \in H^1(F, G_{ad})$ is represented by the F-twisted conjugacy class $[u]$ of u. Suppose $u \in G_{ad}$ corresponds to an inner k-form G' of G: in other words, the k-rational structure of G' is determined by the action of the inner twist $F_u := \mathrm{Ad}(u) \circ F \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$ of the k-automorphism F on G. We will denote this k-form of $\mathbf{G}$ by G^u.

Unless stated otherwise, we will assume that $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_{qs}$ (and thus $G = G_{qs}$). With this choice, the quasi-split k-form G_{qs} corresponds to the privileged element in $H^1(F, G)$ such that $[u] = [1]$.

Remark 1.2. *Observe that any $g \in G$ induces a k-isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{Ad}(g) : G^u \to G^{g*u}$$

where F_{g*u} is obtained by twisting the Frobenius by $g * u := guF(g)^{-1}$. Therefore, the k-isomorphism class of G^{F_u} depends only on the F-twisted conjugacy class $[u]$ of u (corresponding to a unique element $[z] \in H^1(F, G)$).

Vogan [Vog] introduced the notion of *pure inner forms*, and formulated refined versions of the local Langlands conjectures in terms of these inner forms. The pure inner forms of G correspond to cocycles $z \in Z^1(F, G)$, while the equivalence classes of pure inner forms of G are parameterized by the cohomology set $H^1(F, G)$. We remark that the natural map $H^1(F, G) \to H^1(F, G_{ad})$ is in general neither injective nor surjective; therefore, not all inner forms of G are pure in general, and inequivalent pure inner forms may define equivalent inner forms. As before, every cocycle $z \in Z^1(F, G)$ is determined by its image $z(F) \in G$ of the Frobenius element, and the equivalence classes of *inner forms* are parameterized by the F-twisted conjugacy classes of elements of G so obtained.

1.2. **The relative root datum.** Let W_0 be the relative Weyl group of $G = G_{qs}$ with respect to the maximal k-split subtorus $(S^F)^\circ \subset S$. Following [Spr, Sections 15.3.6-15.3.8] we define the relative root datum $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{qs}} = (X_{\mathrm{qs}}, F_{\mathrm{qs}}, Y_{\mathrm{qs}}, F_{\mathrm{qs}}^\vee)$ for (G^F, S^F). Set $V = \mathbf{R} \otimes X_*$. The restriction map of characters of S to $(S^F)^\circ$ induces an orthogonal projection (with respect to a suitable $W_0(\Sigma_0^\vee)$-invariant inner product) $\Pi : V \to V^\theta$. Let $Y_{\mathrm{qs}} := X^*((S^F)^\circ)$ be the character lattice of $(S^F)^\circ$, then $Y_{qs} := \Pi(X_*) = \Pi(X^*(S)) \subset V^\theta$. Moreover $\Pi(\Sigma_0^\vee) \subset Y_{\mathrm{qs}}$ is an integral, but possibly non-reduced root system. The root system $R_0^\vee$ is defined to be the set of not multipliable elements of the $\Pi(\Sigma_0^\vee)$ (hence $R_0^\vee$ is reduced). Then Y_{qs} is contained in the weight lattice $P(R_0^\vee)$ of $R_0^\vee$. The dual lattice is $X_{\mathrm{qs}} = X_*(S)^\theta = X^{*,\theta}$. We introduce $R_0 \subset X_{\mathrm{qs}}$ as the set of co-roots of $R_0^\vee$, and there exists a unique base $F_{\mathrm{qs}}^\vee$ of the relative root system $R_0^\vee$ of G_{qs} such that the projection of the cone spanned by $\Delta_0^\vee$ is the cone spanned by $F_{\mathrm{qs}}^\vee$. We have thus defined a based root datum $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{qs}} = (X_{\mathrm{qs}}, F_{\mathrm{qs}}, Y_{\mathrm{qs}}, F_{\mathrm{qs}}^\vee)$.

This based affine root datum $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{qs}}$ underlies the extended affine Iwahori-Matsumoto Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}$ with respect to the Iwahori subgroup $\mathbb{B}_{\mathrm{qs}} \subset \mathbf{G}_{\mathrm{qs}}$. Let T be the complex torus whose cocharacter lattice is the lattice $Y_{\mathrm{qs}} := X^*((S^F)^\circ)$. Then $X_{qs} = X^*(T)$ and we have $T = S^\vee/(1-\theta)(S^\vee)$. The latter quotient is canonically in bijection with the set of semisimple conjugacy classes of ${}^LG = G^\vee \rtimes \langle\theta\rangle$ (cf. [Bo, Section 6]). On the other hand, let $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{IM}}$ be the centre of $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}$. Then the spectrum of $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{IM}}$ can be identified with the quotient $W_0\backslash T$. Hence we have shown that we can identify the set of semisimple conjugalcy classes of ${}^LG$ canonically with $\mathtt{Spec}\,\mathcal{Z}^{\mathrm{IM}}$.

1.3. **Unipotent types.** We keep our notations. Since $\mathbf{G}$ is unramified, by [BT, 5.1.10] there exist a maximal K-split k-torus $\mathbf{S} \subset \mathbf{G}$ which is maximally k-split. Fix such a torus $\mathbf{S}$. In the Bruhat-Tits building of G there exists an F_u-stable apartment $\mathcal{A}$, which, as an affine space, is isomorphic to $\mathbf{R} \otimes X_*(S)$. Denote by $S_{\mathcal{O}} = \mathcal{O}_K^\times \otimes X_*(S)$ the maximal bounded subgroup of S, we have $X_*(S) \simeq S/S_{\mathcal{O}}$ as abelian groups. The extended affine Weyl group W is defined to be the quotient $N_G(S)/S_{\mathcal{O}}$.

Kottwitz [Kot1] introduced the following exact sequence

$$1 \to G_1 \to G \to \mathrm{Hom}(Z^\vee, \mathbf{C}^\times) \to 1, \tag{1.1}$$

with $Z^\vee$ the centre of $G^\vee$. This exact sequence yields

$$1 \to G_1^{F_u} \to G^{F_u} \to \left(\mathrm{Hom}(Z^\vee, \mathbf{C}^\times)\right)^{\langle\theta\rangle} \to 1. \tag{1.2}$$

It can be shown that the group $G_1 = \langle S_{\mathcal{O}}, G_{\mathrm{der}}\rangle$ is generated by $S_{\mathcal{O}}$ and by the derived group G_{der} of G (see [Op3, Corollary 2.2]).

There exists an F_u-stable alcove C in $\mathcal{A}$ (see e.g. [Tits]). A (F_u-stable) *standard parahoric* subgroup of G is a subgroup of the form $\mathrm{Stab}_G(F_P) \cap G_1$, where $F_P \subset C$ is a (F_u-stable) facet of C. A parahoric subgroup $\mathbb{P}$ of G is a subgroup conjugate to the standard parahoric subgroup. Also we defined $\mathbb{B} = \mathrm{Stab}_G(C) \cap G_1$ and call $\mathbb{B}$ the standard *Iwahori* subgroup of G. By [PR, Proposition 3 in appendix] these definitions are equivalent to the original definition in [BT]. Let $\mathbb{P}_+$ be the pro-p-radical of $\mathbb{P}$. The reductive quotient $\overline{\mathbb{P}} := \mathbb{P}/\mathbb{P}_+$ is a reductive finite group of Lie type, whose Dynkin diagram is a subdiagram of the affine Dynkin diagram of the root system $\Sigma_0^\vee$ of G.

Let $\Omega_C < W$ be the subgroup which leaves the alcove C stable. Then $\Omega_C \cong N_G(\mathbb{B})/\mathbb{B}$. Elements of Ω_C can be interpreted as special automorphisms (cf. [Lus1, 1.11]) of the affine diagram associated with the choice of C. This allows a semi-direct product decomposition $W = W^a \rtimes \Omega_C$ as a normal subgroup W^a (which is an affine Coxeter group) with Ω_C, and gives rise to an isomorphism $\Omega \cong \Omega_C$.

A *(maximal) unipotent type* of G^u is a triple $(u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ where $u \in \Omega_{ad}$ indicates the k-rational structure of G determined by F_u, $\mathbb{P}$ is a (maximal) F_u-stable parahoric subgroup of G, and σ is a cuspidal unipotent representation of $\overline{\mathbb{P}}^{F_u}$ (See §12.1 of [Car]). Here we lift σ to a representation of $\mathbb{P}^{F_u}$ (also denoted σ) via the natural projection $\mathbb{P}^{F_u} \to \overline{\mathbb{P}^{F_u}}$. Following Lusztig [Lus1, 1.21], we say an irreducible smooth representation π of G^{F_u} is *unipotent*, if there exists a unipotent type $(u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ of G, such that the $\mathbb{P}_+$-invariants of the restriction of π to $\mathbb{P}$ contains σ. The irreducible unipotent representations corresponding to a unipotent type $(u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ exhaust finitely many Bernstein components which are all of the same dimension, equal to the dimension of the center of the minimal Levi group of G^{F_u} containing $\mathbb{P}^{F_u}$ ([Lus1, Lus2, Mo]). By [Lus1, paragraph 1.6] the sets of irreducible unipotent representations associated to unipotent types $(u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ and $(u, \mathbb{P}', \sigma')$ respectively are either disjoint or equal; the latter case arises if and only if $(u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma) \sim (u, \mathbb{P}', \sigma')$ (i.e. are G^{F_u}-conjugate).

Definition 1.3. *We denote by $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{u}}(G,u)$ the finite set of G^{F_u}-conjugacy classes of unipotent types of G^u, and by $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G,u)$ the set of G^{F_u}-conjugacy classes of unipotent types of G^u such that $\mathbb{P}^{F_u}$ is a maximal parahoric subgroup of G^{F_u}.*

We denote by $\mathcal{U}(G,u)$ the set of irreducible cuspidal unipotent characters of G^{F_u}, and by $\mathcal{U}(G)$ the disjoint union of the sets $\mathcal{U}(G,u)$ where u runs over a complete set of representatives of the equivalence classes of inner twists of F. We denote by $\mathcal{U}^d(G,u)$ and $\mathcal{U}^d(G)$ the (finite) sets of irreducible discrete series in $\mathcal{U}(G,u)$ and $\mathcal{U}(G)$ respectively, and by $\mathcal{U}^c(G,u) \subset \mathcal{U}^d(G,u)$ and $\mathcal{U}^c(G) \subset \mathcal{U}^d(G)$ the sets of irreducible supercuspidal representations in $\mathcal{U}(G,u)$ and $\mathcal{U}(G)$ respectively.

Lusztig's disjointness result [Lus1, paragraph 1.6] *allows us to define a canonical surjective map (called the parahoric support)* $\mathtt{ps} : \mathcal{U}(G,u) \to \mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{u}}(G,u)$.

If $(u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ is maximal, the compact induced representation $\text{c-Ind}_{\mathbb{P}^{F_u}}^{G^{F_u}} \sigma$ is a finite direct sum of irreducible supercuspidal representations. Hence these irreducible summands are in $\mathcal{U}^c(G,u)$, and all elements of $\mathcal{U}^c(G,u)$ are obtained in such manner. The characterization and study of the sets $\mathcal{U}^c(G,u)$ is the main subject of this paper.

1.4. **The group of weakly unramified characters.** *From here onward we will assume in addition that* $\mathbf{G}$ *is absolutely almost simple.* Recall that the canonical action of Frob on the based root datum of $G^\vee$ is denoted by θ. The corresponding (algebraic) automorphisms of $G^\vee$, $B^\vee$, $T^\vee$ and Ω are also denoted by θ. We have canonical isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{Hom}(Z^\vee, \mathbf{C}^\times) \cong \Omega; \quad \mathrm{Hom}(Z({}^LG), \mathbf{C}^\times) \cong \Omega/(1-\theta)\Omega.$$

Using these identifications, Kottwitz's isomorphism theorem [Kot, Theorem 1.2], [DeRe] can be formulated by saying that the cohomology set $H^1(F,G)$ is in natural bijection with the abelian group $\Omega/(1-\theta)\Omega$. In particular, up to coboundaries we can always realize cocycles in $Z^1(F,G)$ such that $u=z(F)\in\Omega$.

We denote Ω^θ the elements of Ω commute with θ. In the present situation $\Omega^\theta = X^{*,\theta}/Q(\Sigma_0)^\theta = X_{\mathrm{qs}}/Q(R_0)$, and thus only depends on the relative root datum $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{qs}}$. Indeed, it is well known that the elements of Ω are in canonical bijection with the set $C\cap X^*$ by mapping $\omega\in\Omega$ to $\omega(0)\in C\cap X^*$. This maps Ω^θ to $(C\cap X^*)^\theta$, hence every element of Ω^θ can be represented by a θ-invariant element of X^*. If X^* equals the weight lattice $P(\Sigma_0)$ of Σ_0, it is an easy check to see that $X_{\mathrm{qs}}=P(\Sigma_0)^\theta$ equals the weight lattice $P(R_m)$ of the root system R_m introduced in [Op2, Definition 2.10] for the Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}$. We denote this maximal group $P(R_m)/Q(R_0)$ of special diagram automorphisms of the affine Dynkin diagram of $(\Sigma_0^\vee)^{(1)}$ by Ω^θ_{ad}. This case corresponds to the group $\mathbf{G}_{ad}$ of adjoint type isogenous to G. Fix an F_u-stable Iwahori subgroup $\mathbb{B}$ of G so that $\Omega^\theta_{ad}=N_{G_{ad}}(k)(\mathbb{B}^{F_u})/\mathbb{B}^{F_u}$.

An important role is played by the groups $X^*_{\mathrm{nr}}(G)$ and $X^*_{\mathrm{nr}}(G^{F_u})$ of (weakly) unramified complex characters of G and of $G^{F_u}=\mathbf{G}(k)$ respectively. These are finite abelian groups (since we have assumed that $\mathbf{G}$ is almost simple). There is a natural identification of $X^*_{\mathrm{nr}}(G^{F_u})$ and $X^*_{\mathrm{nr}}(\mathbf{G}_{\mathrm{qs}}(k))$. One also has a natural identification of $X^*_{\mathrm{nr}}(G^{F_u})$ with Ω^* by the restriction map to $N_G(\mathbb{B})$. Similarly, by restriction to $N_{G^{F_u}}(\mathbb{B}^{F_u})$ we have a canonical isomorphism $X^*_{\mathrm{nr}}(G^{F_u})\cong(\Omega^\theta)^*$, where $(\Omega^\theta)^*$ denotes the Pontryagin dual of Ω^θ. Combining with the short exact sequence (1.2) of Kottwitz, we *conclude* that the group G_1 is the simultaneous kernel of all the unramified complex characters of G.

The group $(\Omega^\theta)^*$ acts on the set of unipotent characters of G^{F_u} by tensoring. This action is compatible with the action of this group on the Iwahori Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}$ by algebra automorphisms (recall that $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}\cong\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM},a}\rtimes\Omega^\theta$ is a crossed product algebra of an affine Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM},a}$ by Ω^θ). In terms of the relative root datum $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{qs}}$, we can write $X^*_{\mathrm{nr}}(\mathbf{G}_{\mathrm{qs}}(k))\simeq(X_{\mathrm{qs}}/Q_{\mathrm{qs}})^*\subset T^{W_0}$. Observe that $(X_{\mathrm{qs}}/Q_{\mathrm{qs}})^*=(P^\vee_{\mathrm{qs}}/Y_{\mathrm{qs}})$ canonically.

1.5. **The action of Ω^θ_{ad} on $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{u}}(G,u)$.** The set $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{u}}(G,u)$ (with $u\in N_{G_{ad}}(\mathbb{B}_{ad})$ and $u\mathbb{B}_{ad}:=\omega\in\Omega_{ad}$) carries a natural action of Ω^θ_{ad}.

From the viewpoint of combinatorics, this can be understood by interpreting Ω^θ_{ad} as an abelian group of θ-invariant special diagram automorphisms on the affine Dynkin diagram of $(\Sigma_0^\vee)^{(1)}$. The set of G^u-conjugacy classes of F_u-stable parahoric subgroups is in natural bijection with the set of $(\omega\circ\theta)$-invariant subsets of $(\Sigma_0^\vee)^{(1)}$. This action of Ω^θ_{ad} on the set of conjugacy classes of can be enhanced to an action on $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{u}}(G,u)$, as will be explained below.

Observe that for an F_u-stable standard parahoric subgroup $\mathbb{P}$ of G_{sc}, and $x\in\Omega_{ad}$, the standard parahoric $x(\mathbb{P})$ is $F_{u'}$-invariant, where u and u' are cohomologous 1-cocycles. We have $u=u'$ if and only if $x\in\Omega^\theta_{ad}$.

Let us understand that above action of Ω_{ad}^{θ} on the set of G^u-conjugacy classes of F_u-stable parahoic subgroups on a more conceptual level. This will also explain the extension of the action on $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{u}}(G,u)$. We use the group G_1 (cf. (1.1)) in this construction.

Proposition 1.4. *The derived group* $G^u(k)_{\mathrm{der}}$ *of* $G^u(k)=G^{F_u}$ *is the image of the simply connected covering map* $\psi:\mathbf{G}_{sc}(k)\to\mathbf{G}(k)$. *Moreover* $G^u(k)/G^u(k)_{\mathrm{der}}\cong\Omega^{\theta}\otimes k^{\times}$. *We have*

$$G_1^{F_u}=\langle\psi(\mathbf{G}_{sc}(k)),S(\mathcal{O}_k)\rangle. \tag{1.3}$$

Proof. This is a variation of [Op3, Proposition 2.1, Corollary 2.2]. Since a semisimple group over k of simply connected type is equal to its own derived group, $\mathbf{G}^u(k)_{\mathrm{der}}$ contains the image of the simply connected covering map $\psi:\mathbf{G}_{sc}^u(k)\to\mathbf{G}^u(k)$. Applying the long exact sequence in nonabelian cohomology to the central isogeny $\mathbf{G}_{sc}^u\to\mathbf{G}^u$ and using that $H^1(k,\mathbf{G}_{sc}^u)=1$, the equality follows. The cokernel $G^u(k)/G^u(k)_{\mathrm{der}}$ is computed as in [Op3]. Using this, we can transpose the proof of [Op3, Corollary 2.2] to the current case verbatim to prove the remaining assertions (observing that [PR, Proposition 3 in appendix] implies that $\mathbb{B}^{F_u}=\mathrm{Fix}(C)^{F_u}\cap G_1^{F_u}$). ☐

As was remarked in appendix of [PR], the normal subgroup $G_1^{F_u}\lhd\mathbf{G}^u(k)$ is generated by all parahoric subgroups of $\mathbf{G}^u(k)$, and in particular every parahoric subgroup of G^{F_u} is contained in $G_1^{F_u}$.

There is a bijective correspondence between the set of parahoric subgroups of $G_{sc}^{F_u}$ and of G^{F_u}, by taking the ψ-inverse image of a parahoric subgroup of $G^{F_u}(k)$. The inverse map is defined by sending a parahoric $\mathbb{P}^{F_u}$ of $G_{sc}^{F_u}$ to the normalizer $N_{G_1{}^{F_u}}(\psi(\mathbb{P}^{F_u}))$ of $\psi(\mathbb{P}^{F_u})$ in $G_1^{F_u}$. (Indeed, this normalizer is a parahoric subgroup of G^{F_u} by a straightforward application of the main result of the appendix of [PR]). In particular, we may identify the sets $\mathcal{P}^{\sharp}(G_{sc},u)$ and $\mathcal{P}^{\sharp}(G,u)$ of F_u-stable parahoric subgroups of G_{sc} and G respectively, since both sets are in natural bijection with the set of F_u-stable facets of the Bruhat-Tits building of G_{ad} (cf. appendix of [PR]).

Let us now explain the action of Ω^{θ} on the set $\mathcal{P}(G_{sc},u)$ of G^{F_u}-conjugacy classes in in $\mathcal{P}^{\sharp}(G_{sc},u)$. First of all, $\mathbf{G}_{ad}$ can be viewed as the group of inner automorphisms of $\mathbf{G}_{sc}$ via the adjoint action. Hence via the central isogeny $\mathbf{G}\to\mathbf{G}_{ad}$, $\mathbf{G}$ also acts on $\mathbf{G}_{sc}$ by inner automorphisms. However, by (1.1) we see that the adjoint action of G on G_{sc} has an outer component in general, and similarly for the adjoint action of G^{F_u} on $G_{sc}^{F_u}$ by (1.2). Clearly G^{F_u} acts on $\mathcal{P}^{\sharp}(G,u)$ by inner automorphisms, and the orbit space of this action is equal to $\mathcal{P}(G,u)$. We can identify $\mathcal{P}^{\sharp}(G,u)$ via the above natural bijection to $\mathcal{P}^{\sharp}(G_{sc},u)$, which comes equipped with the inner action by $G_{sc}^{F_u}$. It follows from the construction of the bijection and (1.3) that the set $\mathcal{P}(G,u)$ can be naturally identified with the set of $G_1^{F_u}$-orbits in $\mathcal{P}^{\sharp}(G_{sc},u)$. Therefore the quotient $G^{F_u}/(G_1^{F_u})=\Omega^{\theta}$ acts on $\mathcal{P}(G_{sc},u)$, and the orbit space $\mathcal{P}(G,u)=\Omega_{ad}^{\theta}\backslash\mathcal{P}(G_{sc},u)$ is the set of G^{F_u}-conjugacy classes of F_u-stable parahorics of G. In particular, Ω_{ad}^{θ} acts on $\mathcal{P}(G,u)=\Omega_{ad}^{\theta}\backslash\mathcal{P}(G_{sc},u)$, with quotient isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}(G_{ad},u)$.

Using well known properties of unipotent characters we may extend these actions to actions on the sets of conjugacy classes of unipotent types. For example, let us consider the action of Ω^{θ} on $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{u}}(G_{sc},u)$. We first remark that if $\mathbb{P}_{sc}\in\mathcal{P}^{\sharp}(G_{sc},u)$ and $\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}^{\sharp}(G,u)$

correspond to each other, then the sets of cuspidal unipotent representations of $\mathbb{P}_{sc}$ and of $\mathbb{P}$ are in canonical bijection. Indeed, in view of the construction of the bijection, this statement reduces to the well known *fact* that the set of unipotent representation of a connected reductive group $\mathcal{G}$ defined over the residue field of k is independent of the type of $\mathcal{G}$ within its isogeny class (cf. [Lus] or [Car, Section 12.1]). It is also well known that a cuspidal unipotent character of a finite group of Lie type $\overline{\mathbb{P}}^{F_u}$, with $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ defined over $\mathbf{F_q}$, is invariant for twisting by any automorphism of $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ defined over $\mathbf{F_q}$ (cf. [Lus1, Paragraph 1.9]). These facts imply in the above situation that the action of Ω^θ on $\mathcal{P}(G_{sc}, u)$ by conjugation extends *in a trivial way* to an action of Ω^θ on the sets $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{u}}(G_{sc}, u)$ and $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G_{sc}, u)$. Observe that by the above result of Lusztig, the action of the isotropy group $\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta} \subset \Omega^\theta$ of the conjugacy class $[\mathbb{P}_{sc}]$ of $\mathbb{P}_{sc}$ on the set of cuspidal unipotent characters of $\mathbb{P}_{sc}$ is trivial, for all $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}^\sharp(G, u)$. Similarly for the action of Ω^θ_{ad} on $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{u}}(G, u)$ and $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G, u)$.

Since Ω^θ_{ad} is abelian, the isotropy group $\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta}_{ad}$ of $[\mathbb{P}] \in \mathcal{P}(G, u)$ is the same for all parahorics in the same Ω^θ_{ad}-orbits. Hence we can also canonically attach this isotropy group to the orbit $\Omega^\theta_{ad}[\mathbb{P}] \in \mathcal{P}(G_{ad}, u)$.

1.6. **Cuspidal unipotent representations.** The set $\mathcal{U}^c(G, u)$ (see Definition 1.3) is naturally partitioned in subsets $\mathcal{U}^c(G, u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ via the parahoric support map $\mathtt{ps}$. The fibre $\mathtt{ps}^{-1}(u, \mathfrak{s}) := \mathcal{U}^c(G, u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ consists of the set of equivalence classes of the direct summands of the representation c-$\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathbb{P}^{F_u}}^{G^{F_u}}(\sigma)$, where $(\mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ is a maximal F_u-stable unipotent type of G^u, and where $\mathfrak{s} = [(\mathbb{P}, \sigma)] \in \mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G, u)$ denotes the conjugacy class of this unipotent type. Since $\mathcal{U}^c(G, u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ only depends on $(u, \mathfrak{s})$ we may and will sometimes write $\mathcal{U}^c(G, u, \mathfrak{s})$ instead of $\mathcal{U}^c(G, u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma)$. In this cuspidal case, we have an isomorphism (cf. [Lus1])

$$\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma)} := \mathrm{End}_{G^{F_u}}(\text{c-}\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathbb{P}^{F_u}}^{G^{F_u}}\,\sigma) \simeq \mathbf{C}[\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta}],$$

where $\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta} = \Omega^\theta \cap \Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta}_{ad}$. Thus we have

$$\mathcal{U}^c(G) = \bigsqcup_{[u]\in H^1(k,\mathbf{G}_{ad})} \left(\bigsqcup_{\mathfrak{s}\in\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G,u)} \mathcal{U}^c(G, u, \mathfrak{s}) \right) \tag{1.4}$$

with

$$\mathcal{U}^c(G, u, \mathfrak{s}) = \mathcal{U}^c(G, u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma) \simeq \mathrm{Irr}(\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta}) = (\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta})^* \tag{1.5}$$

We remark that, similar to the discussion in the previous paragraph, $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G, u) \simeq \Omega^\theta\backslash\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G_{sc}, u)$. Hence the action of Ω^θ_{ad} on $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G, u)$ factors through an action of $\Omega^\theta_{ad}/\Omega^\theta$. Observe that the elements of $X^*_{\mathrm{nr}}(G^{F_u})$ are trivial on any parahoric subgroup of G^{F_u} (since these are contained in $G_1^{F_u}$). Hence the fibres $\mathtt{ps}^{-1}(u, \mathfrak{s})$ are stable for taking tensor products with weakly unramified characters. The action is the obvious one on the above parameterisation of the fibre: We have $\mathtt{ps}^{-1}(u, \mathfrak{s}) \cong (\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta})^*$ and $(\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta})^*$ is a quotient of the group $X^*_{\mathrm{nr}}(G^{F_u}) \cong (\Omega^\theta)^*$ (via restriction). Taking tensor products corresponds to the multiplication action of $X^*_{\mathrm{nr}}(G^{F_u})$ on $(\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta})^*$ via the quotient map, which is transitive with isotropy group $(\Omega^\theta/\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta})^* \subset X^*_{\mathrm{nr}}(G^{F_u})$.

Hence we see from the above decompositions on a combinatorial level that $\mathcal{U}^c(G)$ carries an action of the abelian group $(\Omega^\theta)^* \times (\Omega^\theta_{ad}/\Omega^\theta)$, whose set of orbits is naturally parameterized by the set

$$\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G_{ad}) := \bigsqcup_{[u]\in H^1(k,\mathbf{G}_{ad})} \mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G_{ad},u) \tag{1.6}$$

Let us turn to the structure of the endomorphism algebra $\mathrm{End}_{G^{F_u}}(\text{c-Ind}_{\mathbb{P}^{F_u}}^{G^{F_u}}\sigma)$ for an arbitrary F_u-stable parahoric subgroup $\mathbb{P}$ (not necessary maximal). Again this endomorphism algebra is isomorphic to the $(\mathbb{P}^{F_u},\sigma)$-spherical Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma)}$, which can be decomposed into a direct sum of two-sided ideals $\mathcal{H}^{\psi}$ which are mutually isomorphic extended affine Hecke algebras (see [Lus1]). The two-sided ideals $\mathcal{H}^{\psi}$ are parameterized by characters ψ of a certain subgroup $\Omega_1^{\mathbb{P},\theta}\subset\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta}$ defined as follows. We have

$$\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma)} \cong \mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma),a} \rtimes \Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta}. \tag{1.7}$$

where $\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma,a)}$ is isomorphic to a fixed unextended affine Hecke algebra associated with a Coxeter system and a parameter function, which are all defined in terms of the unipotent type $(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma)$.

The subgroup $\Omega_1^{\mathbb{P},\theta}$ can be described as follows. Suppose $\mathbb{P}$ is the stablizer of some F_u-orbit of facets F_P in the fundamental alcove C. Let $\Omega_1^{\mathbb{P},\theta}\subset\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta}$ be the subgroup of elements which pointwise fix the set of F_u-orbits of vertices of C not in F_P. And let $\Omega_2^{\mathbb{P},\theta} := \Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta}/\Omega_1^{\mathbb{P},\theta}$ be the quotient. It follows that ([Lus1])

$$\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma)} \cong \left(\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma),a}\rtimes\Omega_2^{\mathbb{P},\theta}\right)\otimes\mathbf{L}[\Omega_1^{\mathbb{P},\theta}] = \mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma),e}\otimes\mathbf{L}[\Omega_1^{\mathbb{P},\theta}]. \tag{1.8}$$

where $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{C}[v,v^{-1}]$ and $\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma),e}=\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma),a}\rtimes\Omega_2^{\mathbb{P},\theta}$ is an extended affine Hecke algebra. This yields the decomposition in terms of two-sided ideals $\mathcal{H}^{\psi}$ as announced above.

1.7. **Discrete unramified Langlands parameters.**

Recall that an *unramified local Langlands parameter* for G is a homomorphism

$$\lambda : \langle\mathrm{Frob}\rangle\times\mathbf{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})\to {}^LG \tag{1.9}$$

such that $\lambda(\mathrm{Frob}\times\mathrm{id})=s\theta$ with $s\in G^\vee$ semisimple and λ is algebraic on the $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$-factor. We call λ *discrete* if $C_{G^\vee}(\lambda)$ is a finite group.

We will denote the set of all unramified local Langlands parameters of G by $\Lambda^{ulp}(G)$, and by $\Lambda^{dulp}(G)$ the set of all discrete unramified local Langlands parameters of G. Given $\lambda\in\Lambda^{dulp}(G)$ we denote by $[\lambda]$ its orbit in $\Lambda^{dulp}(G)$ for the action of $G^\vee$ by conjugation. We will write $\overline{\Lambda^{dulp}(G)}$ for the set of orbits $[\lambda]$ in $\Lambda^{dulp}(G)$.

The group of weakly unramified complex characters $X^*_{\mathrm{nr}}(G^{F_u})\cong(\Omega^\theta)^*$ of G^{F_u} acts naturally on $\overline{\Lambda^{dulp}(G)}$ (cf. [Bo, 8.5]), and it acts on the set of irreducible characters of G^{F_u} by taking tensor products. The local Langlands correspondence is expected the be equivariant for these actions [Bo, 10.2]. We remark that a central isogeny $G_1\to G_2$ of unramified semisimple groups defined over k induces a covering map ${}^LG_2\to{}^LG_1$ which induces a *surjective* "functorial map"

$$\overline{\Lambda^{ulp}(G_2)}\to\overline{\Lambda^{ulp}(G_1)}$$

with finite fibres such that the inverse image of $\Lambda^{dulp}(G_1)$ is $\Lambda^{dulp}(G_2)$ (the lifting of unramified local Langlands parameters is always possible because W_k/I_k is infinite cyclic, and $\mathbf{SL}_2$ is simply connected; and the second assertion is obvious).

Since $(\Omega^\theta)^*$ is the central subgroup of the torus $T = \mathrm{Hom}(X_{\mathrm{qs}}, \mathbb{C}^\times) = \mathrm{Hom}(X^{*,\theta}, \mathbb{C}^\times)$, the orbits of $(\Omega^\theta)^* = X_{\mathrm{qs}}/Q(R_0)$ on $\Lambda^{dulp}(G)$ are the fibres of the functorial map $\overline{\Lambda^{dulp}(G)} \to \overline{\Lambda^{dulp}(G_{sc})}$. We denote by $[\lambda_{sc}] = (\Omega^\theta)^*[\lambda]$ the image of $[\lambda]$ under this map, and by $[\lambda_{ad}] \in \overline{\Lambda^{dulp}(G_{ad})}$ a lifting of λ in $\overline{\Lambda^{dulp}(G_{ad})}$. The isotropy subgroup of λ_{ad} with respect to the action of the group $(\Omega^\theta_{ad})^*$ only depends on λ_{sc}.

1.8. **Formal degrees, residues of μ-functions, and adjoint gamma factors.** We normalize the Haar measure on the locally compact group G^{F_u} as in [Op3, paragraph 2.2.2].

Given a discrete series character π of G^{F_u} and this normalization of Haar measures, one assigns a positive rational number $\mathrm{fdeg}_{G^u(k)}(\pi)$. In the case of a unipotent discrete series character $\pi \in \mathcal{U}^d(G, u)$, this rational number can be upgraded to a rational function $\mathrm{fdeg}(\pi)$ of an indeterminate v such that $\mathrm{fdeg}_{G^u(k)}(\pi) = \mathrm{fdeg}(\pi)(\mathbf{q}^{1/2})$. Here is the construction: Given π with $\mathbf{ps}(\pi) = \mathfrak{s} = (\mathbb{P}, \sigma)$, the space $V_{\delta_\pi} := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{P}}(\sigma, V_\pi)$ realizes an irreducible discrete series representation δ_π at $v = \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{q}^{1/2}$ of the normalized Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma)}$ as discussed in the text around (1.7) (which is defined over the ring $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{C}[v, v^{-1}]$). It is known by [BKH] that $\mathrm{fdeg}_{G^u(k)}(\pi) = \mathrm{fdeg}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{v}}}(\pi)$. The right hand side of this equation has a natural extension as a rational function in v with rational coefficients (the “generic formal degree” of [OS, Theorem 5.12], restricted to the parameter line corresponding to $\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma)}$).

We can make this more precise using some additional notation. Let $\mathbf{K}$ denote the field of rational functions in v with complex coefficients, and let $\mathbf{M}'$ be the subgroup of $\mathbf{K}^\times$ generated by $\mathbf{Q}^\times$, by $(v - v^{-1})$ and by the q-integers $[n]_q := \frac{v^n - v^{-n}}{v - v^{-1}}$. Note that for all $d \in \mathbf{M}'$ we have $d(\mathbf{v}^{-1}) = \pm d(\mathbf{v})$. Now let $\mathbf{M} \subset \mathbf{M}'$ be the subgroup such that

$$\mathbf{M} = \{d \in \mathbf{M}' \mid d(\mathbf{v}) > 0 \text{ if } \mathbf{v} > 1\}.$$

Observe that $\mathbf{M}$ is a free abelian group.

Proposition 1.5. *(See* [OS, Theorem 5.12]*,* [Op2, Theorem 4.8]*). The formal degree* $\mathrm{fdeg}(\pi)$ *is an element of the free abelian group* $\mathbf{M}$*.*

Given an element $f \in \mathbf{M}$, we denote by f_q (the ”q-rational part”) the rational expression obtained by deleting all rational prime factors in the numerator and the denominator of f.

It was conjectured [HII, Conjecture 1.4] (also see [GR, Conjecture 7.1]) that the local Langlands correspondence for G has the following property regarding formal degrees. We normalize the Haar measures of G^{F_u} and $G^{F_u}_{\mathrm{qs}}$ as explained in [DeRe] (also see [Op3]). Let π be an irreducible admissible discrete series character of G^{F_u}, and let λ denote the corresponding local Langlands parameter. Then λ should be a discrete local Langlands parameter for G, and the formal degree $\mathrm{fdeg}(\pi)$ of π should be equal to a certain rational number c_π independent of $\mathbf{q}$ times the *adjoint gamma factor* $\gamma(\lambda)$ of the discrete Langlands parameter λ. It is easy to see that $\gamma(\lambda) \in \mathbf{M}$. Hence this conjecture states that one should have (in view of our normalization of Haar measures):

$$\mathrm{fdeg}(\pi) = c_\pi v^{-\dim(\mathbf{G})} \gamma(\lambda) \tag{1.10}$$

The set $\overline{\Lambda^{dulp}(G)}$ of equivalence classes of discrete unramified local Langlands parameters of G is in canonical bijection with the set $\mathrm{Res}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{qs}}, \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{qs}})$ of Weyl group orbits of so-called *residual points* of the generic Iwahori-Matsumoto Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}_{\mathbf{L}}$ associated to the quasi-split form of G, see [Op1, OS] and [Op3, Section 2.3] (where $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{C}[v^{\pm 1}]$, with $v^2 = q$, and m_{qs} denotes the parameter function on $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{qs}}$ associated to $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}_{\mathbf{L}}$). As discussed in [Op3, Section 4.6], if $[\lambda] \in \overline{\Lambda^{dulp}(G)}$ corresponds to such an orbit of residual points $W_0\mathtt{r}$ with $\mathtt{r} \in T(\mathbf{L}) = \mathrm{Hom}(X_{\mathrm{qs}}, \mathbf{L}^\times)$, then

$$\gamma_q(\lambda) = \pm v^{\dim(\mathbf{G})} \mu_q^{\{\mathtt{r}\}}(\mathtt{r}), \tag{1.11}$$

where $\mu_q^{\{\mathtt{r}\}}(\mathtt{r})$ denotes the q-rational factor of the "residue" of the μ-function of $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}_{\mathbf{L}}$ at $\mathtt{r}$. Therefore, in the language of [Op2], (1.10) is equivalent to the *existence* of a *cuspidal spectral transfer morphism* $\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma),e}_{\mathbf{L}} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}$ *with image* $W_0\mathtt{r}$. Here $\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma),e}_{\mathbf{L}} \simeq \mathbf{L}$ is a direct summand of $\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma)}_{\mathbf{L}} \simeq \mathbf{L}[\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta}]$ associated to an extension $\tilde{\sigma}$ of σ to $N_{G^{F_u}}(\mathbb{P})$. In [Op3, Theorem 3.4] such existence result for STMs was proved, not only for cuspidal unipotent affine Hecke algebras but in general. The *existence* aspect of [Op3, Theorem 3.4], i.e. the existence of STMs $\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma),e}(G,u) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^{IM}(G_{qs})$ for unipotent affine Hecke algebras [Op3, Theorem 3.4] leads to a proof of (1.10) for all unipotent discrete series representations (see [Op3, Theorem 4.11]).

The uniqueness aspect of [Op3, Theorem 3.4] is the general assertion that STMs of the form $\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma),e}(G,u) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^{IM}(G_{qs})$ are unique up to diagram automorphisms. It was shown in [Op3, Paragraph 3.2.8] that this uniqueness aspect reduces to the cuspidal case, and proving this cuspidal case is the main goal of the present paper (cf. [Op3, Proposition 3.8]). Our main theorem Theorem 1.6(a) precisely states this remarkable uniqueness result: For $\pi \in \mathcal{U}^c(G,u)$, the equation

$$\mathrm{fdeg}_q(\pi) = \gamma_q(\lambda) \tag{1.12}$$

with $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda^{dulp}(G)}$ has a *unique* $(\Omega^\theta)^*$-orbit of solutions. We remark that for a given maximal unipotent pair $(\mathbb{P}, \sigma)$, all members of $\mathcal{U}^c(G,u,\mathbb{P},\sigma) \simeq (\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta})^*$ have the same formal degree.

The proof of this uniqueness result for solutions of (1.12) is far from being easy, especially for the classical cases. For exceptional groups, the proof is a relatively easy case by case verification which was done by Reeder [R2] for split groups, and the remaining exceptional cases were treated in [Fe1]. The proof for classical cases is in the present paper, and uses the *existence* of STMs [Op3, Theorem 3.4] as one of the major tools. In particular, for even orthogonal and symplectic groups the so-called *extra-special STMs* [Op3, Paragraph 3.2.6] turn out to be of crucial importance to heavily cut down the list of potential solutions of (1.12). In view of the main role of these extra-special STMs we have included an extensive description of their action on residual points (the "extraspecial algorithm") in Section 4.

The remaining parts of Theorem 1.6 of our main theorem give some intriguing additional observations which we came across in our case-by-case considerations. It describes a relation between the isotropy group of the action of Ω^θ on a cuspidal unipotent type $\mathfrak{s}_{sc}$ of G_{sc} and the action of $(\Omega^\theta)^*$ on a corresponding discrete unipotent Langlands parameter λ such that its orbit $\lambda_{sc} = (\Omega^\theta)^*\lambda$ is the unique solution of (1.12) for any $\pi \in \mathcal{U}^c$

with $\mathtt{ps}(\pi) = \mathfrak{s} = \Omega^\theta \mathfrak{s}_{sc} := (\mathbb{P}, \sigma)$. It also expresses the number of cuspidal unipotent representations σ supported by $\mathbb{P}$ (which is a fundamental aspect of the representation theory of the finite group $\overline{\mathbb{P}^{F_u}}$) of Lie type in terms the Langlands parameter λ.

1.9. **Statement of the main result.** We are ready to formulate our main result. We start by recalling the notations.

Let $\mathbf{G}$ be a connected absolutely almost simple group, defined and unramified over a nonarchimedean local field k. Write $G = \mathbf{G}(K)$ and denote by F the action of Frob on G. Let $\mathbf{G}_{ad} = \mathbf{G}/Z(\mathbf{G})$ denote the adjoint form of $\mathbf{G}$. For $u \in \Omega_{ad}$ we denote by $F_u := \mathrm{Ad}(u) \circ F$ the action of Frob on G corresponding to an inner form of $\mathbf{G}$ denoted by $\mathbf{G}^u$. Let $(u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ be a maximal F_u-stable unipotent type of G^u. Recall the set $\overline{\Lambda^{dulp}(G)}$ of $G^\vee$-conjugacy classes of discrete unramified Langlands parameters of G. We define a subset $\overline{\Lambda^{dulpcud}(G,[u])}$ of $\overline{\Lambda^{dulp}(G)}$ as follows: $[\lambda] \in \overline{\Lambda^{dulpcud}(G,[u])}$ if there exists a cuspidal unipotent representation π of an inner form G^u of G for which $\gamma_q(\lambda) = \mathrm{fdeg}_q(\pi)$. Define

$$\overline{\Lambda^{dulpcud}(G)} := \bigcup_{[u] \in \Omega_{ad}/(1-\theta)\Omega_{ad}} \overline{\Lambda^{dulpcud}(G,[u])}$$

to be the set of equivalence classes of discrete unramified Langlands parameters *with cuspidal unipotent degree.*

Theorem 1.6. (a) *For all cuspidal unipotent representations* $\pi \in \mathcal{U}^c(G,u,\mathbb{P},\sigma)$, *there* exists *a* unique $(\Omega^\theta)^*$*-orbit* $[\lambda_{sc}] := (\Omega^\theta)^*[\lambda] \in (\Omega^\theta)^* \backslash \overline{\Lambda^{dulp}(G)} = \overline{\Lambda^{dulp}(G_{sc})}$ *of elements* $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda^{dulp}(G)}$ *such that*

$$\mathrm{fdeg}_q(\pi) = \gamma_q(\lambda). \tag{1.13}$$

(b) *The assignment* $(u, [\mathbb{P}, \sigma]) \mapsto [\lambda_{sc}]$ *in* (a) *determines a* canonical surjection *from* $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G,u)$ *(cf.* (1.6)*) to* $\overline{\Lambda^{dulpcud}(G_{sc},[u])}$. *The fibre over* $[\lambda_{sc}]$ *consists of all cuspidal unipotent types* $\mathfrak{s}'$ *such that* $\mathfrak{s}' = \mathtt{ps}(\pi') \in \mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G,u)$ *for some solution* $\pi' \in \mathcal{U}^c(G,u)$ *of* (1.13). *For any* $\mathfrak{s}' = [\mathbb{P}', \sigma']$ *in the fibre we have*

$$[\mathbb{P}_{ad}] := (\Omega^\theta_{ad}/\Omega^\theta)[\mathbb{P}] = (\Omega^\theta_{ad}/\Omega^\theta)[\mathbb{P}'] =: [\mathbb{P}'_{ad}] \tag{1.14}$$

(c) *If* $[\lambda] \in \overline{\Lambda^{dulpcud}(G,[u])}$ *is such that* $[\lambda_{sc}] = (\Omega^\theta)^*[\lambda]$ *is the image of* $[\mathbb{P}, \sigma] \in \mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G,u)$ *in the surjection of* (b), *then the isotropy group of* $[\lambda]$ *in* $(\Omega^\theta)^*$, *denoted by* $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{[\lambda]}$, *contains the group* $(\Omega^\theta/\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta})^*$, *where* $\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta}$ *is the isotropy group in* Ω^θ *of the unique* F_u*-stable maximal parahoric group* $\mathbb{P}_{sc}$ *of* G^u_{sc} *corresponding to* $\mathbb{P}$.

(d) *Assume that* $[\lambda] \in \overline{\Lambda^{dulpcud}(G,[u])}$ *and* $[\mathbb{P}, \sigma] \in \mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G,u)$ *are related as in* (c). *Let* $s = \lambda(\mathrm{Frob}, \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right))$ *be the corresponding torsion point. Let* v_s *denote the node of the Kac diagram corresponding to* $W_0 s$ *(see* [R3]*). Let* n_s *be the coefficient of the node* v_s *in the Kac diagram (see the list in Kac's book* [Kac]*). Put* $g = |(\Omega^\theta)^*_{[\lambda]} : (\Omega^\theta/\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta})^*|$ *(which makes sense by* (c)*) and* $g' = |\Omega^\theta_{ad}/\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta}_{ad} : \Omega^\theta/\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta}|$.

Following Lusztig [Lus1, Lus2], *let a be the number of $[\lambda]' \in \overline{\Lambda^{dulpcud}(G,[u])}$ satisfying* (1.13) *(with π fixed), let b be the number of cuspidal local systems supported by $[\lambda]$ corresponding to solutions $\pi \in \mathcal{U}^c(G,u)$ of* (1.13) *(with λ fixed). Let a' be $|\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta}|$ times the number of conjugacy classes of F_u-stable maximal parahoric subgroups $\mathbb{P}' \subset G^u$ such that there exists a solution $\pi' \in \mathcal{U}^c(G,u)$ of* (1.13) *(with λ fixed) satisfying $\mathtt{ps}(\pi') = [(\mathbb{P}',\sigma')]$ for some cuspidal unipotent representation σ' of $\mathbb{P}'$, and finally let b' be the number of cuspidal unipotent representations σ' of $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ such that $\deg(\sigma') = \deg(\sigma)$. Then*

- (i) *$b' = \phi(n_s)$, where ϕ denotes Euler's totient function. In particular, $\phi(n_s)$ is identically equal to 1 for groups isogeneous to classical groups, thus for those groups the assignment in* (b) *is bijective.*
- (ii) *We have $ab = a'b'$, which is equal to the total number of $\pi \in \mathcal{U}^c(G,u)$ satisfying* (1.13) *(with λ fixed).*
- (iii) *If $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_{ad}$, then a, b are equal to Lusztig's "geometric $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}$", and a', b' are equal to Lusztig's "arithmetic $\mathfrak{a}', \mathfrak{b}'$" (cf.* [Lus1]*).*
- (iv) *It follows from* (a), (b) *and* (c) *that: $a = |(\Omega^\theta)^* : (\Omega^\theta)^*_{[\lambda]}|$, $a' = g'|\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta}|$, and thus we find easily that $b = gg'\phi(n_s)$.*

In particular, because of (c)*, there exists an essentially unique $(\Omega^\theta)^*$-equivariant* bijection *between $\mathcal{U}^c(G)$ and the set of cuspidal local systems supported by the orbits in $\overline{\Lambda^{dulpcud}(G)}$ which is compatible with the surjection in* (b)*, up to choosing an extension of each σ from $\mathbb{P}$ to $N_G(\mathbb{P})$, which fixes the bijections $\mathcal{U}^c(G,u,\mathbb{P},\sigma) \simeq$* $\mathrm{Irr}(\Omega^{\mathbb{P},\theta})$.

Some remarks are in order.

Remark 1.7. *The main point of Theorem 1.6(d) is (i), since the other assertions follow in a straightforward way from parts (a), (b) and (c) of Theorem 1.6. For the proof of Theorem 1.6 it is easy to see that it is enough to consider $\mathbf{G}$ of adjoint type. For the exceptional split adjoint groups, Reeder's work* [R2] *proves Theorem 1.6 except part (d), but part (d) follows easily from Lusztig* [Lus1] *(The crucial identity (i) in (d) can be checked by the table in §7 loc.cit. .) For non-split but quasi-split groups, see* [Fe1, Fe2]. *In conclusion, to complete the proof of Theorem 1.6 it is enough to verify Theorem 1.6 (a), (b), (c) and (i) of (d) for the adjoint groups of the various classical families. This is the task we will perform in the present paper.*

Remark 1.8. *If G^{F_u} is classical and not anisotropic, and π is a cuspidal unipotent character, then it is easy to check that* $\mathrm{fdeg}_q(\pi)$ *is the reciprocal of a product of* even *cyclotomic polynomials. This remark plays a key role in the case by case analysis we need to do, as it turns out that the condition on an unramified discrete local Langlands parameter λ that $\gamma_q(\lambda)$ has only* even *cyclotomic polynomials both in its numerator and denominator, is already very restrictive.*

Remark 1.9. *The set of orbits for the action of $(\Omega^\theta)^* \times (\Omega^\theta_{ad}/\Omega^\theta)$ on $\mathcal{U}^c(G)$, as observed in Paragraph 1.6, is in natural bijection with $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G_{ad})$. By Theorem 1.6*(b) *we have a natural surjection $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{mu}}(G_{ad}) \to \overline{\Lambda^{dulpcud}(G_{sc})}$. As was mentioned above, one expects that the local Langlands correspondence maps each orbit in a $(\Omega^\theta)^*$-equivariant way to* *the* $(\Omega^\theta)^*$*-set* $\overline{\Lambda^{dulpcud}(G)}$*, which satisfies* $(\Omega^\theta)^*\backslash\overline{\Lambda^{dulpcud}(G)} = \overline{\Lambda^{dulpcud}(G_{sc})}$*. The role of the action of* $(\Omega^\theta_{ad}/\Omega^\theta)$ *is less obvious.*

Remark 1.10. *Theorem 1.6 (a) can be reformulated in the terminology of* [Op2] *as the existence and uniqueness of a cuspidal spectral transfer morphism* $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{L}}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma),e} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{sc})$ *for every cuspidal maximal parahoric subgroup* $\mathbb{P}$ *of any inner form* G^u *of* G*. The existence aspect of Theorem 1.6 (a) is proved in* [Op3] *and* [Fe1, Fe2]*. In this paper we are concerned with proving the* uniqueness*. We remark that analogous existence and uniqueness results are known for split exceptional groups by the work of Reeder* [R1, R2]*. The remaining exceptional cases are treated in* [Fe2]*.*

Remark 1.11. *The Langlands parameters in* $\overline{\Lambda^{dulpcud}(G)}$ *have very special properties with respect to parabolic induction.*

Let $H \subset G$ *be a standard* k*-Levi subgroup of* G*, and* $[\lambda] \in \overline{\Lambda^{dulpcud}(H)}$*, and let* δ_{cu} *be a cuspidal unipotent character of* H *corresponding to* $[\lambda]$ *in the sense that its formal degree has the same* q*-rational factor as* $\gamma_H(\lambda_H)$*. According to Theorem 1.6, there is an essentially unique matching residue point* $W_H\mathbf{r}_H$ *in the spectrum of the of the Iwahori-Hecke algebra of* $\mathbf{H}_{\mathrm{qs}}$*. In view of* [Op1]*, there exists an associated* Iwahori-spherical *discrete series character* δ *of* $\mathbf{H}_{\mathrm{qs}}$ *whose formal degree also has the same* q*-rational factor as* $\gamma_H(\lambda_H)$*. By the uniqueness of* $[\lambda_H]$*, the characters* δ_{cu} *of* $H(k)$ *and* δ *of* $H_{\mathrm{qs}}(k)$ *should both belong to the* L*-packet of the parameter* λ_H*. And indeed, it can be checked* [Op3] *that the spectral decomposition of the (generalized) principal series induced from the cuspidal representation* δ_{cu} *of* $H(k)$ *to* $G(k)$ *on the one hand, and of the principal series induced from the discrete series* δ *of* $H_{\mathrm{qs}}(k)$ *to* $G_{\mathrm{qs}}(k)$ *on the other hand, are closely related.*

The spectral decomposition of the former is described by the Plancherel decomposition of a unipotent affine Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma),e}$ *(with* $\mathbb{P}_H := \mathbb{P} \cap H(k)$ *a maximal parahoric subgroup of* $H(k)$*, and* $(\mathbb{P}_H, \sigma|_{\mathbb{P}_H})$ *a unipotent type as in Theorem 1.6), whereas the latter is described by taking a residue of* $\mu^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}})$ *along the* residual coset $\mathbf{r}_H T^H$*, where* $T^H \subset T$ *is the image in* T *of the connected center of the dual* ${}^LH$ *of* H*. The relation alluded to above between these two, implies essentially that there exists a unique spectral transfer morphism* $\mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma),e} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}})$ *in the sense of* [Op2]*.*

This point of view was worked out in [Op3]*, bringing the classification of unipotent discrete series characters of Lusztig* [Lus1, Lus2] *within the framework of classical harmonic analysis. The fundamental fact on which this method relies is our present Theorem 1.6 (and its generalization to exceptional groups).*

2. The μ-function and the Plancherel measure of $\mathcal{H}$

Our aim is to prove Theorem 1.6 for all unramified classical absolutely simple groups. The case of $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{PGL}_n$ is easy, and was treated in [Op3, 3.2.2]. In all other classical cases, up to *spectral covering morphisms* [Op2, 7.1.3, 7.1.4] (which are irrelevant here, since Theorem 1.6 only deals with the q-rational factors), the Iwahori-Matsumoto Hecke algebra of the quasi-split form of G is of the form $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}} = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{R}, \mathrm{m})$ with $\mathcal{R}$ a based root system of type $\mathrm{C}_l^{(1)}$:

$$\mathcal{R} := (R_0, X, R_0^\vee, Y, F_0) = (\mathrm{B}_l, \mathbf{Z}^l, \mathrm{C}_l, \mathbf{Z}^l, F_0).$$

where $F_0 = \{e_1 - e_2, e_2 - e_3, \dots, e_{l-1} - e_l, e_l\}$ is the basis of the root system of type B_l, with $(e_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ the canonical basis of $\mathbf{Z}^l$. The main results in this paper deal with the above cases. In this article, we will more generally deal with Hecke algebras of general unipotent types $(\mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ of these classical simple groups. These are all, up to spectral covering morphisms, affine Hecke algebras of type $\mathrm{C}_l^{(1)}$. Such Hecke algebras have three independent Hecke parameters, and we will discuss the various parameter values which arise in the above context.

Let $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{C}[v^{\pm 1}]$ be the ring of complex Laurent polynomials in indeterminate v, and let $\mathcal{T}$ denote the diagonalizable group scheme with character lattice $\mathbf{Z} \times X$, viewed as a scheme over $\mathbf{L}$ via the homomorphism $\mathbf{L} \to \mathbf{C}[\mathbf{Z} \times X]$ given by $v \mapsto (1, 0)$. The fibre $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{v}}$ over $\mathbf{v} \in \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbf{L})$ will be denoted by T, which is naturally isomorphic to the complex algebraic torus with character lattice X. We will denote by t_i the character of $\mathcal{T}$ associated to $(0, e_i)$, and by v the character of $\mathcal{T}$ associated with $(1, 0)$.

Let $W := W_0 \ltimes X$ be the extended affine Weyl group, and $R := R_0^\vee \times \mathbf{Z} = \mathrm{C}_l^{(1)}$ its set of affine roots. To a W-invariant integral valued parameter function m_R (see [Op2, 2.1.5]) on R, we associate two half-integral W_0-invariant functions

$$W \backslash R_0 \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathrm{m}_\pm(\alpha) := \frac{1}{2}\big(\mathrm{m}_R(\alpha^\vee) \pm \mathrm{m}_R(1 + \alpha^\vee)\big)$$

on the root system $R_0 = \mathrm{B}_l$, where the values the W-invariant $\mathrm{m}_R(\cdot)$ at simple roots can be read off from the labels of the nodes of the arithmetic diagram directly. We see that $\mathrm{m}_-(\alpha) = 0$ unless $\alpha^\vee \in 2Y$. The W-invariant function m_R contains the same information as the pair of W_0-invariant functions $\mathrm{m}_\pm$ on $R_0 = \mathrm{B}_l$, and the based root datum as above together with the pair of functions $\mathrm{m}_\pm$ determines an affine Hecke algebra associated to the root system of type C_l. This affine Hecke algebra is denoted by $\mathcal{H} = \mathrm{C}_l(m_-, m_+)[q^{\mathfrak{b}}]$ (see [Op3, 3.2.1]), where $\mathfrak{b} := \mathrm{m}_+(\pm e_i \pm e_j)$, and $\mathfrak{b}m_\pm := \mathrm{m}_\pm(e_i)$.

We firstly assign to each root $\alpha \in R_0$ a c-factor $c_{\mathrm{m},\alpha}$ defined by

$$c_{\mathrm{m},\alpha} = \frac{(1 + v^{-2\,\mathrm{m}_-(\alpha)}\alpha^{-1})(1 - v^{-2\,\mathrm{m}_+(\alpha)}\alpha^{-1})}{1 - \alpha^{-2}}.$$

Next, we form the c-function c_{m} by multiplying all the c-factors $c_{\mathrm{m},\alpha}$ with α runs through all the positive roots in R_0:

$$c_{\mathrm{m}} = \prod_{\alpha \in R_{0,+}} c_{\mathrm{m},\alpha}.$$

The μ-function of $\mathcal{H} = \mathrm{C}_l(m_-, m_+)[q^{\mathfrak{b}}]$ is a W_0-invariant rational function on T (see [Op2, Definition 3.2]) which is explicitly given by:

$$\mu_{\mathcal{R},m_\pm,d} = \mu_{m_-,m_+,d}(\mathcal{R}) = v^{-2\,\mathrm{m}_W(w_0)} \frac{d}{c_{\mathrm{m}} c_{\mathrm{m}}^{w_0}}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\mathrm{m}_W : W \to \mathbf{Z}$ is given by

$$\mathrm{m}_W(w) = \sum_{a \in R_+ \cap w^{-1}(R_-)} \mathrm{m}_R(a),$$

while w_0 is the longest element in the finite Weyl group W_0, and d is a normalization factor which is closely related to the formal degree (see the discussion below).

Given an $\mathbf{L}$-valued point $\mathtt{b} \in T(\mathbf{L})$ of T we define, for $\epsilon = \pm 1$,

$$p_\epsilon(\mathtt{b}) = \{\alpha \in R_0 \mid \epsilon\alpha(\mathtt{b}) = v^{-2m_\epsilon(\alpha)}\}$$

and

$$z_\epsilon(\mathtt{b}) = \{\alpha \in R_0 \mid \epsilon\alpha(\mathtt{b}) = 1\}.$$

A *residue point* $\mathtt{r} \in T(\mathbf{L})$ is an $\mathbf{L}$-valued point of T such that:

$$|p_+(\mathtt{r})| + |p_-(\mathtt{r})| - |z_+(\mathtt{r})| - |z_-(\mathtt{r})| = l.$$

We **remark** that the residue point is a dimension 0 *residual coset*. Indeed, every residual coset $L \subset T$ determines a root sub-system $R_L = \{\alpha \subset R_0 : \alpha|_L \text{ is constant}\}$. This root sub-system is *parabolic* in the sense that R_L is equal to $\mathbf{R}R_L \cap R_0$ (the intersection of the $\mathbf{R}$-span of R_L with R_0). Let T_L be the subtorus whose cocharacter lattice Y_L equals to $Y \cap \mathbf{Q}R_L^\vee$ (Y in the root datum), and let T^L be the subtorus whose cocharacter lattice Y^L is $Y \cap (R_L)^\perp$. Then L is a coset of T^L inside T, and there is a residual point $\mathtt{r} \in T_L$ such that $L = \mathtt{r}T^L$. For more background on residual cosets we refer to [Op1].

It is useful and necessary to consider the *regularization* μ^L *of the* μ*-function along a residual coset* L (see [Op2, 3.2.3]). If $L = \{\mathtt{r}\}$ is a residual point as defined above, then $\mu^{\{\mathtt{r}\}}$ is the rational function on T defined by omitting the factors in the denominator and in the numerator of μ which are identically equal to zero when evaluated at $\mathtt{r} \in T(\mathbf{L})$. Hence $\mu^{\{\mathtt{r}\}}$ defines a nonzero rational function (denoted by $\mu^{(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$) in v when evaluating at $\mathtt{r}$ (compare to computing the residue of a rational function at a simple pole). Explicitly, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{(\{\mathtt{r}\})} &:= \mu^{\{\mathtt{r}\}}(\mathtt{r}) \\ &= d\frac{v^{-2\,\mathrm{m}_W(w_0)}\prod_{\alpha\in R_0\backslash z_-(\mathtt{r})}(1+\alpha^{-1}(\mathtt{r}))\prod_{\alpha\in R_0\backslash z_+(\mathtt{r})}(1-\alpha^{-1}(\mathtt{r}))}{\prod_{\alpha\in R_0\backslash p_-(\mathtt{r})}(1+v^{-2\,\mathrm{m}_-(\alpha)}\alpha^{-1}(\mathtt{r}))\prod_{\alpha\in R_0\backslash p_+(\mathtt{r})}(1-v^{-2\,\mathrm{m}_+(\alpha)}\alpha^{-1}(\mathtt{r}))} \in \mathbf{K}^\times. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Here $\mathbf{K}$ is defined to be the fraction field of $\mathbf{L}$. For a general residual coset $L = \mathtt{r}_L T^L$, we can decompose $\mu^{(L)}$ as follows. We can assume (if necessary, use an element $w \in W_0$ to translate L) that $R_L = R_P$ is a *standard parabolic* root sub-system defined by $P \subset F_0$. Then we have the factorization

$$\mu^{(L)} = \mu_{R_P}^{(\{\mathtt{r}\})}\mu_{R_0\backslash R_P} := \mu_{R_P}^{(\{\mathtt{r}\})}\frac{v^{-2m_{W_0}(w^P)}}{\prod_{\alpha\in R_{0,+}\backslash R_{P,+}}(c_{m,\alpha}c_{m,\alpha}^{w_P})}, \tag{2.3}$$

where $w^P = w_0 w_P^{-1} \in W^P$ is the longest element (see [Op2, Proposition 3.8]). The smooth density $\mu^{(L)}(\mathtt{r}_L t)\mathrm{d}^L t$ is known to be *smooth* on $L^{temp} := \mathtt{r}_L T_u^L$ and, up to W_0-invariant, locally constant rational factors, the sum of such densities over all residual cosets L is equal to the push forward of the Plancherel measure on the the spectrum of the center $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{H})$ of $\mathcal{H}$ (see [Op1]).

By interpreting the roots as characters of T we can write the μ-function as a rational function in v and $t_i \in T$. For example, in our present situation where $R_0 = \mathrm{B}_l$ and $X = \mathbf{Z}^l$, the root system can be expressed as

$$\{t_i^{\pm 1} t_j^{\pm 1} : 1 \leq i < j \leq l\} \cup \{t_k^{\pm 1} : 1 \leq k \leq l\}.$$

Therefore we can write the normalized μ-function of $\mathrm{C}_l(m_-, m_+)[q^{\mathfrak{b}}]$ as:
(2.4)

$$\mu_{\mathrm{m},d}(\mathrm{B}_l) = \frac{d}{v^{2\mathfrak{b}\, \mathrm{m}_W(w_0)}} \prod_{1\leq i<j\leq l} \frac{v^{4\mathfrak{b}}(1-t_it_j^{-1})^2(1-t_it_j)^2}{(1-v^{-2\mathfrak{b}}t_it_j^{-1})(1-v^{2\mathfrak{b}}t_it_j^{-1})(1-v^{-2\mathfrak{b}}t_it_j)(1-v^{2\mathfrak{b}}t_it_j)} \times$$
$$\prod_{k=1}^{l} \frac{v^{2\mathfrak{b}(m_-+m_+)}(1+t_k)^2(1-t_k)^2}{(1+v^{-2\mathfrak{b}m_-}t_k)(1+v^{+2\mathfrak{b}m_-}t_k)(1-v^{-2\mathfrak{b}m_+}t_k)(1-v^{+2\mathfrak{b}m_+}t_k)}$$

To conclude this section we describe the normalization factors d appearing in the μ-function. Firstly, every generic affine Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{R}, m)$ can be equipped with an $\mathbf{L}$-valued trace defined by

$$\tau^1(N_w) = \delta_{w,e}.$$

Such defined τ^1 gives a family of $\mathbf{C}$-valued traces $\mathbf{R}_{>1} \ni \mathbf{v} \mapsto \tau^1_{\mathbf{v}}$ on the $\mathbf{R}_{>1}$-family of algebras of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{v}}$, the specialization of $\mathcal{H}$ at $\mathbf{v}$. There exists a conjugate linear anti-involution $*$ on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{v}}$ defined by $N_w^* = N_{w^{-1}}$. It is a fundamental fact that for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{R}_{>1}$, the 3-tuple $(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{v}}, \tau^1_{\mathbf{v}}, *)$ defines a type I Hilbert algebra.

The following definition of *normalized affine Hecke algebra* is borrowed from [Op2, Definition 3.1].

Definition 2.1. *Given a generic affine Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}$ and an $\mathbf{L}$-valued trace τ^1, we define $\tau^d(\cdot) = d\tau^1(\cdot)$ with $d \in \mathbf{M}$. The pair $(\mathcal{H}, \tau^d)$ is called a normalized affine Hecke algebra.*

The formal degree of a discrete series representation of $\mathcal{H}$ depends on the normalization of the trace of $\mathcal{H}$. If $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma),e}$ is a unipotent affine Hecke algebra of rank r associated to a unipotent type $(u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ of an unramified semisimple group G, then we normalize the trace τ of $\mathcal{H}$ by

$$\tau^d(1) = d = (\mathrm{vol}(\mathbb{P}^{F_u}))^{-1} \deg \sigma$$

Here the Haar measure of G^{F_u} is normalized in such a way that $\mathrm{vol}(\mathbb{P}^{F_u})$ is equal to $v^{-\dim(\overline{\mathbb{P}}^{F_u})}$ times the cardinality of the group of $\mathbf{F_q}$-points of $\overline{\mathbb{P}}^{F_u}$. Then $d \in \mathbf{M}$ (cf. [Op3]), $d^0 := (v - v^{-1})^r d$ is regular and nonzero at $v = 1$, and by [Op2, Theorem 4.8] we have:

(i) $\mathrm{fdeg}(\pi) \in \mathbf{M}$, for all discrete series π of $\mathcal{H}$.
(ii) $\mathrm{fdeg}(\pi)(v)$ is regular and nonzero at $\mathbf{v} = 1$, and $\mathrm{fdeg}(\pi)(v^{-1}) = \mathrm{fdeg}(\pi)(v)$.
(iii) If r is a residual point, then up to a nonzero rational constant, $\mathrm{fdeg}(\pi)(\mathbf{v})$ is equal to $\mu^{(\{\mathbf{r}\})}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v}))$ for all $\mathbf{v} > 1$.

3. RESIDUE POINTS AS IMAGES OF STANDARD STMS

The notion of spectral transfer morphism (abbreviated to STM) was discussed in [Op2, Section 5], thus we will not give the exact definiton of STM verbatim. Instead we collect some useful facts on STM in this article, aiming at the relations of STM to the residual points and formal degrees.

Recall that the spectral transfer category $\mathfrak{C}$ has normalized affine Hecke algebras as objects and equivalence classes of spectral transfer maps as morphisms (see [Op2, Definition 5.9]). Choose an affine morphism

$$\phi_T : T_1 \to T_2$$

which represents the STM

$$\phi : (\mathcal{H}_1, \tau^{d_1}) \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{H}_2, \tau^{d_2})$$

and let $[\phi] = W_{2,0} \circ \phi_T$ be the associated class of morphisms. Then by the *image* $\mathrm{Im}([\phi])$ we mean the $W_{2,0}$-orbit of residual cosets $W_{2,0}\phi_T(T_1)$ which lies in $W_{2,0}\backslash T_2$. The *rank* and *co-rank* of $[\phi]$ are respectively defined to be $\mathrm{rk}([\phi]) = \dim(T_1) - 1$ and $\mathrm{cork}([\phi]) = \dim(T_2) - \dim(T_1)$. We say ϕ is a *spectral covering map* if $\mathrm{cork}([\phi]) = 0$.

A rank 0 affine Hecke algebra is simply $\mathbf{L}$. A normalized rank 0 Hecke algebra is equipped with a trace τ^0 on $\mathbf{L}$, given by the normalization factor $d^0 = \tau^0(1) \in \mathbf{M}$. The following result is straightforward from the definitions in [Op2]:

Proposition 3.1. [Op2, Proposition 7.11] *Let $(\mathcal{H}, \tau^d)$ be an arbitrary normalized affine Hecke algebra with $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{R}, m)$, and let $\mathtt{r}$ be a generic residual point of $(\mathcal{R}, m)$. Define*

$$d^0(\mathbf{v}) = \mu^{(\{\mathtt{r}\})}(\mathbf{v}, \mathtt{r}(\mathbf{v})) \in \mathbf{K}^\times$$

where μ is the μ-function associated with $\mathcal{H}$. Then $d^0 \in \mathbf{M}$ (thus defines a normalization τ^{d^0} of $\mathbf{L}$), is regular and nonzero at $\mathbf{v} = 1$, and $\phi_T(\mathbf{v}) = \mathtt{r}(\mathbf{v})$ defines a rank 0 STM $\phi : (\mathbf{L}, \tau^{d^0}) \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{H}, \tau^d)$. Conversely, all STMs ϕ to $(\mathcal{H}, \tau^d)$ of $\mathrm{rk}(\phi) = 0$ are of this form. This sets up a canonical bijection between the set of rank 0 STMs with target $(\mathcal{H}, \tau^d)$, and the set of W_0-orbits of residual points $\mathtt{r} \in T(\mathbf{L})$ for $\mathcal{H}$.

In [Op3, 3.1.2, 3.1.3] it was pointed out that every spectral transfer morphism is induced from a rank 0 spectral transfer morphism to the semisimple quotient $\mathcal{H}_L$ of a "standard Levi subalgebra" $\mathcal{H}^L$ of $\mathcal{H}$, where $L \subset T$ is some residual coset. However, *the converse is not true.* An STM $\phi : (\mathbf{L}, \tau^0) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}_L$ of rank 0 corresponds to an orbit of residual points $W_L\mathtt{r}_L \in T_L$. This induces the W_0-orbit of residual cosets of the form $\mathtt{r}_L T^L$, which has a Plancherel density $\mu^{(L)}$ as in (2.3). To say that this is the image of an STM of higher rank is essentially equivalent to saying that $\mu^{(L)}$ as in (2.3) "is" the μ-function of another affine Hecke algebra of rank $\dim(L)$. In general this cannot be the case, since $\mu^{(L)}$ has too many poles for this to be possible (so apparently , if W_0L is the image of an STM, then many cancellations of poles and zeroes of $\mu^{(L)}$ have to occur). We call ϕ *cuspidal* if W_0L is the image of an STM (such an STM must be of rank 0). With this terminology we can summarize the above discussion by the **statement** that every STM is induced from a cuspidal STM of a standard sub-quotient algebra of the form $\mathcal{H}_L$.

A truly remarkable fact is that if we restrict ourselves to the collection of unipotent normalized Hecke algebras related to a given unramified absolutely almost simple group G over k (so the normalized affine Hecke algebras associated to the unipotent types of the k-Levi subgroups of inner forms of G) then, within this class of extended affine Hecke algebras, every rank 0 STM to an $\mathcal{H}_L$ as above *is cuspidal* in the sense just explained. This statement follows from the main result of [Op3] and our Theorem 1.6.

We will concentrate on normalized affine Hecke algebras associated to the unitary, orthogonal and symplectic groups of adjoint types. In [Op3, 3.2.6] an associated collection $\mathfrak{C}_{class}$ of affine Hecke algebras was introduced, whose objects are normalized affine Hecke algebras of type $(\mathrm{C}_l(m_-, m_+)[q^{\mathfrak{b}}], \tau_{m_-,m_+})$ with rank $l \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$. The pair of parameters (m_-, m_+) lies in the parameter space $\mathcal{V}$, which is the collection of ordered pairs (m_-, m_+) of elements $m_\pm \in \mathbf{Z}/4$ such that $2(m_- - m_+) \in \mathbf{Z}$. If both $m_+ - m_-, m_+ + m_- \in \mathbf{Z}$ then $\mathfrak{b} = 1$, otherwise we put $\mathfrak{b} = 2$.

Following [Op3, 3.2.6] we now decompose $\mathcal{V}$ into six disjoint subsets $\mathcal{V}^{\mathcal{X}}$ with $\mathcal{X} \in \{\mathrm{I, II, III, IV, V, VI}\}$ as follows. If $m_\pm \in \mathbf{Z} \pm \frac{1}{4}$ and $m_\pm > 0$ we write

$$m_\pm = \kappa_\pm + \frac{2\epsilon_\pm - 1}{4}$$

with $\epsilon_\pm \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\kappa_\pm \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Define $\delta_\pm \in \{0, 1\}$ by $\kappa_\pm \equiv \delta_\pm \pmod 2$. Now we can define the decomposition as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
(m_-, m_+) \in \mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{I}} & \text{iff } m_\pm \in \mathbf{Z}/2 \text{ and } m_- - m_+ \notin \mathbf{Z}, \\
(m_-, m_+) \in \mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{II}} & \text{iff } m_\pm \in \mathbf{Z}/2 \text{ and } m_- - m_+ \in \mathbf{Z}, \\
(m_-, m_+) \in \mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{III}} & \text{iff } m_\pm \in \mathbf{Z} \text{ and } m_- - m_+ \notin 2\mathbf{Z}, \\
(m_-, m_+) \in \mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{IV}} & \text{iff } m_\pm \in \mathbf{Z} \text{ and } m_- - m_+ \in 2\mathbf{Z}, \\
(m_-, m_+) \in \mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{V}} & \text{iff } m_\pm \in \mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4 \text{ and } \delta_- \neq \delta_+, \\
(m_-, m_+) \in \mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{VI}} & \text{iff } m_\pm \in \mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4 \text{ and } \delta_- = \delta_+.
\end{array}$$

These collections of unipotent affine Hecke algebras are associated to unipotent types of the following isogeny classes of unramified classical groups (in the same order): Special unitary groups, special odd orthogonal groups, symplectic groups, special even orthogonal groups, symplectic groups and special even orthogonal groups. The last two of these cases are associated with unipotent types of the inner forms of $\mathbf{G}$ determined by $u \in \Omega/(1-\theta)\Omega$ where via Kottwitz's isomorphism, u corresponds to the action of the center ${}^L Z$ of ${}^L G$ in its spin representations. These cases play a special role, and the associated affine Hecke algebras are called *extra-special*.

We remark that the parameter types are independent of the rank l, and the trace τ_{m_-,m_+} depends on l in the simple uniform fashion

$$\tau_{m_-,m_+}((v^{\mathfrak{b}} - v^{-\mathfrak{b}})^l) = d^0_{m_-,m_+} \tag{3.1}$$

where $d^0_{m_-,m_+}$ is independent of l. The value of $d^0_{m_-,m_+}$ is described in (3.2) below, in terms of degrees of cuspidal unipotent characters of finite groups of Lie type. The normalized affine Hecke algebra $(\mathrm{C}_l(m_-, m_+)[q^{\mathfrak{b}}], \tau_{m_-,m_+})$ thus defined is often denoted by $(\mathcal{H}^l_{m_-,m_+}, \tau_{m_-,m_+})$.

Lusztig has determined the formal degrees of cuspidal unipotent representations of reductive p-adic groups (based on the cuspidal unipotent representations of finite groups of Lie types). Cuspidal unipotent representations are rare, in particular, each of the classical groups of type $\mathrm{A}_l, {}^2\mathrm{A}_l, \mathrm{B}_l, \mathrm{C}_l, \mathrm{D}_l, {}^2\mathrm{D}_l$ has at most one cuspidal unipotent representation (we do not consider type ${}^3\mathrm{D}_4$ here). The conditions for these classical types having cuspidal unipotent representations are imposed onto their ranks l. These conditions as well as the corresponding degrees of cuspidal unipotent representations can be found in [Car, §13.7]. They are rational functions in q with rational coefficients. For those various s which would provide cuspidal unipotent characters for each type as above, we write $d^{\mathcal{Y}}_s(q)$ for the q-rational part (by which we mean a fraction of products of q-integers $[n]_q := \frac{v-v^{-n}}{v-v^{-1}}$ with $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$) of the formal degree of the cuspidal unipotent character for the adjoint group of type $\mathcal{Y} \in \{{}^2\mathrm{A}_l, \mathrm{B}_l, \mathrm{C}_l, \mathrm{D}_l, {}^2\mathrm{D}_l\}$ (where we normalize the volume of the group of $\mathbf{F}_q$-points to 1). We view $d^{\mathcal{Y}}_s(q)$ as a function in q.

Table 1. Cuspidal unipotent representations for classical groups

Types	rank l	No. of cuspidal unipotent characters
A_l	0	Only trivial representation
${}^2\mathrm{A}_l$	$l = s(s+1)/2 - 1$ for some s	1
B_l	$l = s(s+1)$ for some s	1
C_l	$l = s(s+1)$ for some s	1
D_l	$l = s^2$ for some *even* integer s	1
${}^2\mathrm{D}_l$	$l = s^2$ for some *odd* integer s	1

From Carter's book *op. cit* we witness that for types B_l and C_l, they share the same formal degrees of the cuspidal unipotent characters (we shall denote this common formal degree by d^{B}_s); and so do the types D_l and ${}^2\mathrm{D}_l$ (which we shall denote this common formal degree by d^{D}_s). We can prove the following properties of these formal degrees using elementary considerations.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose $s \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We regard d^{B}_s and d^{D}_s as functions in s.*

(i) *These formal degrees of cuspidal unipotent representations are elements of the free abelian group $\mathbf{M}$, and are linearly independent in $\mathbf{M}$.*

(ii) *Apart from a power of q, d^{B}_s and d^{D}_s are products of reciprocals of* even *cyclotomic polynomials Φ_{2m} (with $m \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$).*

As in [Op3, Equation (33)] we define:

$$d^0_{m_-,m_+} = \tau^0_{m_-,m_+}(1) := \begin{cases} d_a^{\{2\mathrm{A}\}}(q)d_b^{\{2\mathrm{A}\}}(q) & \text{if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{I}} \\ d_a^{\mathrm{D}}(q)d_b^{\mathrm{B}}(q) & \text{if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{II}} \\ d_a^{\mathrm{B}}(q)d_b^{\mathrm{B}}(q) & \text{if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{III}} \\ d_a^{\mathrm{D}}(q)d_b^{\mathrm{D}}(q) & \text{if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{IV}} \\ d_a^{\{2\mathrm{A}\}}(q)d_b^{\mathrm{B}}(q^2) & \text{if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{V}} \\ d_a^{\{2\mathrm{A}\}}(q)d_b^{\mathrm{D}}(q^2) & \text{if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{VI}} \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

where $\{a,b : a,b\in\mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$ is determined by the following equalities of sets:

$$\begin{aligned} \{1/2+a,1/2+b\} &= \{|m_+-m_-|,|m_++m_-|\} \text{ if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{I}} \\ \{2a,1+2b\} &= \{|m_+-m_-|,|m_++m_-|\} \text{ if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{II}} \\ \{1+2a,1+2b\} &= \{|m_+-m_-|,|m_++m_-|\} \text{ if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{III}} \\ \{2a,2b\} &= \{|m_+-m_-|,|m_++m_-|\} \text{ if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{IV}} \\ \{1/2+a,1+2b\} &= \{|m_+-m_-|,|m_++m_-|\} \text{ if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{V}} \\ \{1/2+a,2b\} &= \{|m_+-m_-|,|m_++m_-|\} \text{ if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{VI}} \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Observe that these equalities determine a and b in case II, V and VI, and determines a and b up to order in the other cases. Thus the normalization (3.2) is always well defined.

We remark that the normalization for the last two cases V and VI (the "extra-special cases") can be conveniently summarized in the following uniform formula (cf. [Op3, Equation (36)]):

$$d^0_{m_-,m_+} = \prod_{i=1}^{\lfloor |m_--m_+|\rfloor}\left(\frac{v^{2|m_--m_+|-2i}}{1+q^{2|m_--m_+|-2i}}\right)^i \prod_{j=1}^{\lfloor |m_-+m_+|\rfloor}\left(\frac{v^{2|m_-+m_+|-2j}}{1+q^{2|m_-+m_+|-2j}}\right)^j. \tag{3.4}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_+ :&\quad m_+\mapsto -m_+, \quad m_-\mapsto m_- \\ \eta :&\quad m_+\mapsto m_-, \quad\ \ m_-\mapsto m_+ \end{aligned}$$

Then the group Iso $= \langle\eta_+,\eta\rangle$ is isomorphic to the dilhedral group of order 8. This group acts on $\mathfrak{C}_{class}$ by spectral isomorphisms (cf. [Op2, 7.1.2]). We define $\eta_- = \eta\circ\eta_+\circ\eta$.

Besides these spectral isomorphisms, in [Op3, 3.2.6] definitions were given of a set of basic for STMs between the Hecke algebras $\mathrm{C}_l(m_-,m_+)[q^{\mathfrak{b}}]\in\mathfrak{C}^{\mathcal{X}}_{class}$ (with $\mathcal{X}\in\{\mathrm{I},\mathrm{II},\mathrm{III},\mathrm{IV}\}$) and for the STMs of $\mathfrak{C}^{\mathrm{V}}_{class}$ to $\mathfrak{C}^{\mathrm{III}}_{class}$ and the "extra special cases" $\mathfrak{C}^{\mathrm{VI}}_{class}$ to $\mathfrak{C}^{\mathrm{IV}}_{class}$, and it was shown [Op3, Proposition 4.1] that these basic STMs generate all STMs between such types of normalized affine Hecke algebras.

Recall that the basic generating steps for the standard STMs are (reviewing some of the notations in [Op3, 3.2.6]) of the form:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{C}_l(m_-,m_+)[q^2] \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{C}_{l+|m_+|-\frac{1}{2}}(m_- - \epsilon(m_-),m_+)[q^2] & \text{if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{I}}, m_+\notin\mathbf{Z} \\
\mathrm{C}_l(m_-,m_+)[q^2] \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{C}_{l+2|m_+|-2}(m_-,m_+ - 2\epsilon(m_+))[q^2] & \text{if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{I}}, m_+\in\mathbf{Z} \\
\mathrm{C}_l(m_-,m_+)[q] \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{C}_{l+|m_+|-\frac{1}{2}}(m_- - \epsilon(m_-),m_+)[q] & \text{if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{II}} \\
\mathrm{C}_l(m_-,m_+)[q] \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{C}_{l+2|m_+|-2}(m_-,m_+ - 2\epsilon(m_+))[q] & \text{if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{III}} \\
\mathrm{C}_l(m_-,m_+)[q] \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{C}_{l+2|m_+|-2}(m_-,m_+ - 2\epsilon(m_+))[q] & \text{if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{IV}} \\
\mathrm{C}_l(m_-,m_+)[q^2] \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{C}_{2l+\frac{1}{2}a(a+1)+2b(b+1)}(\delta_-,\delta_-)[q] & \text{if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{V}} \\
\mathrm{C}_l(m_-,m_+)[q^2] \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{C}_{2l+\frac{1}{2}a(a+1)+2b^2-\delta_+}(\delta_-,\delta_-)[q] & \text{if } (m_-,m_+)\in\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{VI}}
\end{array}$$

The underlying affine morphisms of algebraic tori for these generators were given in [Op3, 3.2.6, 3.2.7]. The computations to verify that these maps indeed represent STMs were briefly indicated *loc.cit.* . For more detail we refer to [Fe1, Fe2].

Let us temporarily accept the fact that standard STMs exist. Then among the objects of $\mathfrak{C}^{\mathcal{X}}_{class}$ with $\mathcal{X}\in\{\mathrm{I},\mathrm{II},\mathrm{III},\mathrm{IV}\}$, the least spectral isogeny classes of objects with respect to the partial ordering as defined in [Op2, Definition 8.2] are the following:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
[\mathrm{C}_l(\tfrac{1}{2},0)[q^2]] \text{ and } [\mathrm{C}_l(\tfrac{1}{2},1)[q^2]] & \text{if } \ \mathcal{X}=\mathrm{I}, \\
[\mathrm{C}_l(\tfrac{1}{2},\tfrac{1}{2})[q]] & \text{if } \ \mathcal{X}=\mathrm{II}, \\
[\mathrm{C}_l(0,1)[q]] & \text{if } \ \mathcal{X}=\mathrm{III}, \\
[\mathrm{C}_l(0,0)[q]] \text{ and } [\mathrm{C}_l(1,1)[q]] & \text{if } \ \mathcal{X}=\mathrm{IV}.
\end{array} \tag{3.5}$$

Using the standard generators indicated above, we can reach such minimal object by an STM from any of the Hecke algebras in $\mathfrak{C}_{class}$. The reason is as follow. First of all, notice that using the group Iso of spectral isomorphisms, we can interchange m_- and m_+, and map $m_\pm$ to $-m_\pm$. Hence we may assume that $m_\pm$ are both nonnegative. In that situation the STMs listed here strictly decrease the value of $m_- + m_+$. We can continue with this until we reach an object that is isomorphic to one of the four least objects listed above.

On the other hand, we can verify that for connected unramified quasi-split classical groups of special unitary, special odd orthogonal, symplectic and special even orthogonal type, there exist spectral covering morphisms from their Iwahori-Matsumoto Hecke algebras to the corresponding minimal objects.

We **remark** that the order in which we apply the basic translation STMs is not important since they commute, as can be easily checked by direct computation using the explicit formulae of [Op3, 3.2.6]. Also it follows from an easy direct verification that the commutation relations between these translation STMs, extra-special STMs and elements of the group Iso of spectral isomorphisms, are simply via the action of Iso on the pair of parameters (m_-,m_+) of the Hecke algebra.

Definition 3.3. *The STMs of* $\mathfrak{C}_{class}$ *which are generated by the translation STMs above and by the elements of* Iso *are called* standard STMs.

The elementary arguments above show that a standard STM between two objects of $\mathfrak{C}_{class}$ as indicated above is essentially unique.

Thus for each object of $\mathfrak{C}_{class}$ there is an essentially unique (i.e. unique up to spectral automorphisms) standard STM to one of these least objects in $\mathfrak{C}^{\mathcal{X}}_{class}$ with $\mathcal{X} \in \{\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{II}, \mathrm{III}, \mathrm{IV}\}$. Note that the STMs from objects of type $\mathcal{X} = \mathrm{V}$ or VI are in a different nature, and map in one step to a least object of type $\{\mathrm{III}, \mathrm{IV}\}$ respectively. These are called the extra special STMs. In Section 4 we describe the extra-special algorithms which allow us to deal with these extra-special STMs. Existence of these extra-special STMs will also be proved in detail in [Fe2].

Remark 3.4. *From our main Theorem 1.6 and its proof, we can prove a deep result (cf.* [Op3, Proposition 3.8]*). Namely,* all *STMs between two objects of* $\mathfrak{C}_{class}$ *as indicated above are standard. Also, the STMs in the above basic set together with the elements of* Iso *generate all STMs between these type of Hecke algebras. Of course, we will only use the* existence *of standard STMs and their basic properties.*

Remark 3.5. *Note that in cases* $\mathcal{X} = \mathrm{II}, \mathrm{IV}$ *these minimal objects admit a group* Aut_{es} *of order two of spectral automorphisms, which arise from* special *affine diagram automorphisms (cf.* [Lus1, 1.11]*), and for the other cases there are no essentially strict spectral automorphisms.*

Given an unramified, connected absolutely simple group $G_{\mathrm{qs}} = \mathbf{G}_{\mathrm{qs}}(K)$, defined and quasi-split over k, of unitary, orthogonal or symplectic type, and of adjoint type in its isogeny class, let $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{qs}}$ be the relative based root datum which we have constructed in the introduction. Let $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}}) = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{qs}}, \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{qs}})$ be the Iwahori-Hecke algebra of G_{qs}.

Proposition 3.6. *There exists a spectral covering map* $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min}$ *to one of the minimal objects* $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min} = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{R}, \mathrm{m}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})$ *of* $\mathfrak{C}^{\mathcal{X}}_{class}$*. This gives rise to a canonical bijection between the set of* $(\Omega^{\theta}_{ad})^*$*-orbits in* $\mathrm{Res}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathcal{R}_{qs}, \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{qs}})$ *and the set of* $\mathrm{Aut}_{es}(\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})$*-orbits in* $\mathrm{Res}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathrm{m}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})$*.*

Proof. See the description in [Op3, 3.2.7]. The precise relation between the isogeny class of $\mathbf{G}_{\mathrm{qs}}$ and the type $\mathcal{X}$, as well as the covering group of $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min}$ was described in *loc. cit.* . From that description we see easily that the elements of $\mathrm{Aut}_{es}(\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})$ always lift to elements of $(\Omega^{\theta}_{ad})^*$. ☐

As a consequence, we can formulate Theorem 1.6(a), (b) in terms of $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min}$ as follows. This is quite useful, because it reduces most of the work to considering the Hecke algebras of $\mathfrak{C}^{\mathcal{X}}_{class}$.

Proposition 3.7. *Let* $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min}$ *be as in Proposition 3.6. Let* $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}^{u}_{\mathrm{qs}}$ *be an inner form of* $\mathbf{G}_{\mathrm{qs}}$*. Let* $(u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ *be a maximal* F_u*-stable unipotent type of* $G = \mathbf{G}(K)$*. Then there exits a unique* $\mathrm{Aut}_{es}(\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})$*-orbit* $W_0\mathbf{r} \in \mathrm{Res}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathrm{m}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})$ *such that* $(\mu^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})^{(\{\mathbf{r}\})}_{q} = \mathrm{fdeg}_q(\sigma)$*.*

This proposition will be proved in Section 6. Using the existence of standard STMs to $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min}$ we can still sharpen the formulation a little bit. Let $(u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ be as in Proposition 3.7. Then, by definition of $\mathfrak{C}_{class}$, $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{Y}}_0 := (\mathbf{L}, d^0 = \mathrm{fdeg}_q(\sigma))$ is a rank 0 object of $\mathfrak{C}^{\mathcal{Y}}_{class}$ for some $\mathcal{Y} \in \{\mathrm{I, II, III, IV, V, VI}\}$. Let $\phi : \mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{Y}}_0 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min}$ be the unique *standard* STM, and let $\mathrm{Im}(\phi) = W_0\mathtt{r} \in \mathrm{Res}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathrm{m}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})$. Hence assuming the existence of standard STMs we see that Proposition 3.7 is equivalent to:

Corollary 3.8. *Let* $W_0\mathtt{r} \in \mathrm{Res}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathrm{m}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})$ *such that* $(\mu^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})^{(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_q = \mathrm{fdeg}_q(\sigma)$ *for some maximal* F_u*-stable unipotent type* $(u, \mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ *of some inner form* G *of* G_{qs} *determined by* u*. Then* $W_0\mathtt{r}$ *represents a rank-*0 standard *STM* $\phi : \mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{Y}}_0 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min}$*, which is* unique *up to the action of* $\mathrm{Aut}_{es}(\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})$*, where* $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}$ *or* $\mathcal{X} = \mathrm{III}$ *and* $\mathcal{Y} = \mathrm{V}$*, or* $\mathcal{X} = \mathrm{IV}$ *and* $\mathcal{Y} = \mathrm{VI}$*.*

There is another important simplification. Namely, the existence of the extra special STMs imply that all residue degrees of the form $(\mu^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})^{(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_q$ with $\mathcal{X}$ of type III or IV are covered by the cases of type V and VI. The latter residues are computed from Hecke algebras with *generic* parameters in the sense of [OS], and that turns out to be much easier to analyze. In the next section we will make explicit how do the extra-special STMs send the orbits of residual points of Hecke algebras of type V and VI, to $\mathrm{Res}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathrm{m}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})$ for $\mathcal{X} = \mathrm{III}$ and $\mathcal{X} = \mathrm{IV}$ respectively. This will be used extensively in Section 5, where we will study important necessary conditions for $W_0\mathtt{r}$ such that $W_0\mathtt{r}$ could be a solution of an equation of the form $(\mu^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})^{(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_q = \mathrm{fdeg}_q(\sigma)$ for some unipotent cuspidal pair $(\mathbb{P}, \sigma)$.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE EXTRA-SPECIAL ALGORITHMS

Let $\mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{odd,dist}}$ be the collection of all partitions (including the zero partition) with odd, distinct parts. Let

$$\mathsf{R} = \{(m, \rho) \mid m \in \mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4,\ m > 0 \text{ and } \rho \text{ a (possibly zero) partition}\}.$$

We will define two operations $\mathsf{E} : \mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{odd,dist}} \to \mathsf{R}$ and $\mathsf{D} : \mathsf{R} \to \mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{odd,dist}}$ and prove they are inverse to each other. We remark that the map D is similar, and indeed equivalent to the algorithm discussed in [CK, Section 4.4]. It was also shown in [CK] that D is an injective map. [1]

We refer to E as the *extra-special algorithm.*

We first describe $\mathsf{E} : \lambda \mapsto (m, \rho)$. Recall the notion of an *m-tableau* (cf. [Slo, HO]): For a rational number m and a partition λ, we define the m-tableau $T_m(\lambda)$ of λ as the tableau with shape λ with its box $b_{i,j}$ (where the coordinates (i, j) have the same meaning as for matrix entries) filled with the nonnegative real number $|m - i + j|$.

The algorithm E produces a number $m \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4)_+$, and an m-tableau, whose shape we call ρ. The steps to produce m and $T_m(\rho)$ from $\lambda \in \mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{odd,dist}}$ are as follows:

(1) Write λ as a non-negative integral sequence in decreasing order. Define $\jmath = (\lambda - \mathbf{1})/2$, where $(\lambda - \mathbf{1})/2$ means substracting 1 from all nonzero parts of λ, and then dividing each part by 2.

---

[1] We thank Dan Ciubotaru for pointing out the reference [CK] to us.

We stress that we do not regard $\jmath$ as a partition, but as a tuple of nonnegative integers, whose length is equal to the number of nonzero parts of λ.

(2) Let $\kappa \geq 0$ be the excess number of parts of the dominant parity type (even or odd) of $\jmath$. Put $\varepsilon = 1$ if the dominant parity type is odd or if $\kappa = 0$ (in which case we shall call the dominant parity type odd as well), otherwise put $\varepsilon = 0$. Let $m = \kappa + (2\varepsilon - 1)/4$. This gives us the required number $m \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4)_+$.

(3) Let $\jmath' = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_\kappa)$ be the sub-sequence in $\jmath$ of the κ smallest parts of dominant parity type.

(4) Removing $\jmath'$ from $\jmath$ and denote the remaining sub-sequence of $\jmath$ by $\jmath''$. Thus $\jmath''$ has an equal number parts of both parities. Arrange $\jmath''$ in t pairs:

$$\jmath'' = \big((\alpha_1, \beta_1), \ldots, (\alpha_t, \beta_t)\big)$$

with $\alpha_1 > \cdots > \alpha_t$ and $\beta_1 > \cdots > \beta_t$, where for all i, α_i is of dominant parity type and β_i is of the other parity type.

(5) For every pair (α_i, β_i) we denote by $T_m(H(\alpha_i, \beta_i))$ the hook-shaped m-tableau whose *hand* (the box at the end of its arm) is filled with $(\alpha_i - 1/2)/2$, and whose foot has filling $|\beta_i - 1/2|/2$.

Note that we need to take the absolute value in the latter expression since it might happen that the smallest part of $\jmath$ is 0. If $\varepsilon = 1$ then this part 0 of $\jmath$ will appear as $\beta_t = 0$ in the smallest pair (α_t, β_t) of $\jmath''$. Also observe that if $\varepsilon = 0$ then $\kappa > 0$, and then this part 0 of $\jmath$ will appear as the smallest part γ_κ of $\jmath'$. In particular, we always have $(\alpha_i - 1/2)/2 > 0$ for all i.

Let $T_m(H)$ be the m-tableau obtained by nesting the hook shaped tableaux $T_m(H(\alpha_i, \beta_i))$ in decreasing order. Observe that all hooks $T_m(H(\alpha_i, \beta_i))$ contain a box with filling m (namely the box at the corner) and a box with filling $1/4$ (and if $m = 1/4$ then these two boxes coincide). We call such hooks *m-hooks*. Hence the leg of an m-hook has length at least κ, since its corner box has filling m and the box with filling $1/4$ is precisely κ boxes below that.

(6) We add horizontal strips S_i (which may be empty) to $T_m(H)$ (for $i = 1, \ldots, \kappa$). If $\gamma_i < 2(m-i+1)+1/2$, then the strip S_i is empty. Otherwise S_i is the horizontal $(m-i+1)$-tableau whose rightmost extremity has filling $|\gamma_i - 1/2|/2$ (again, we need the absolute value because it might happen that $\gamma_\kappa = 0$, namely if $\jmath$ contains 0 as a part, and if in addition $\varepsilon = 0$). These horizontal strips can be added to $T_m(H)$ in a unique way such that the union is an m-tableau (so S_1 is placed at the "armpit" of $T_m(H)$, and S_{i+1} is placed just below S_i for $i = 1, \ldots, \kappa - 1$).

Observe that for all i the parity type of γ_i is ε. The smallest possible value of γ_i equals $\gamma_i = 2(m - i + 1) - 3/2$, corresponding to S_i being empty. In particular, the smallest possible value of $\jmath_\kappa$ is $\jmath_\kappa = \varepsilon$. If all strips S_i are empty, we have:

$$\jmath' = (\varepsilon + 2(\kappa - 1), \varepsilon + 2(\kappa - 2), \ldots, \varepsilon)$$

Denote the union of the strips S_i by $T_m(S)$. Then $T_m(S)$ is either an m-tableau or empty.

(7) Finally, ρ is the partition whose Young diagram is the shape formed by the union of the m-hooks H and strips S_i in the way indicated above.

As mentioned above, we call the hook-shaped m-tableaux $T_m(H(\alpha_i, \beta_i))$ the *m-hooks* of $T_m(\rho)$. Observe that the m-hooks of $T_m(\rho)$ are precisely the hooks in $T_m(\rho)$ which are m-tableaux, and contain $1/4$. Equivalently, a hook of $T_m(\rho)$ which is an m-tableau is an m-hook if and only if its leg length is at least κ.

Example 4.1. Let $\lambda = (21, 19, 13, 9, 5, 3)$ be an odd distinct partition. We have already ordered the parts of λ in decreasing order. Then we have $\jmath = (10, 9, 6, 4, 2, 1)$. We now have 4 even numbers and 2 odd numbers. Thus the dominant parity type is even (hence $\varepsilon = 0$) and the excess number $\kappa = 4 - 2 = 2$. We get $m = \kappa + (2\varepsilon - 1)/4 = 7/4$.

Now $\jmath' = (4, 2)$. Removing $\jmath'$ from $\jmath$ we obtain $\jmath'' = \big((10, 9), (6, 1)\big)$. Therefore we will have 2 hook-shaped m-tableaux and 2 horizontal strips. The Young tableau is as follow:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
7/4 & 11/4 & 15/4 & 19/4 \\
\hline
3/4 & 7/4 & 11/4 \\
\cline{1-3}
1/4 & 3/4 & \frac{7}{4} \\
\cline{1-3}
5/4 & 1/4 & \frac{3}{4} \\
\cline{1-3}
9/4 \\
\cline{1-1}
13/4 \\
\cline{1-1}
17/4 \\
\cline{1-1}
\end{array}$$

The two horizontal strips are in colours.

We next describe the operation D, namely how to recover the odd distinct partition $\lambda \in \mathsf{P}_{\text{odd,dist}}$ from $(m, \rho) \in \mathsf{R}$.

Recall that $m \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4)_+$. Let κ be the closest integer to m and write $m = \kappa + (2\varepsilon - 1)/4$ with $\varepsilon = 0$ or 1. This uniquely determines a parity type ε and a nonnegative integer κ. Define $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ by $\kappa = \delta + 2\mathbf{Z}$.

The m-tableau $T_m(\rho)$ can be written as a disjoint union of nested $T_m(\rho)$-hooks which are themselves m-tableaux. If one of these hook shapes is an m-hook than all its predecessors are m-hooks too (since the condition for such hook to qualify as m-hook is that its leg length is at least κ). Hence $T_m(\rho)$ has a unique decomposition as the union $T_m(H) \cup T_m(S)$ of two m-tableaux (both possibly empty) such that H is the largest

m-tableau contained in $T_m(\rho)$ which is a union of m-hooks, and S is the complement of H in $T_m(\rho)$. By the above we see that S is itself an m-tableau (or empty) without m-hooks, and that S has at most κ parts.

We number the shapes of the the nested m-hooks in $T_m(\rho)$ in decreasing order as $H_1, \cdots, H_t$. For every i, $T_m(H_i)$ defines unique pair of nonnegative integers (α_i, β_i) such that $T_m(H_i) = T_m(H(\alpha_i, \beta_i))$. Indeed, if the hand of $T_m(H_i)$ has filling $A_i \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4)_+$ and its foot has filling $B_i \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4)_+$, then α_i is the unique integer of parity type ε nearest to $2A_i \in (\mathbf{Z} + 1/2)_+$ (which is easily seen to be $2A_i + 1/2$), and β_i is the unique integer of parity type $1 - \varepsilon$ nearest to $2B_i \in (\mathbf{Z} + 1/2)_+$. In particular, every such pair (α_i, β_i) consists of nonnegative integers with opposite parity type.

Recall that S itself is an m-tableaux (or empty) with at most κ parts. Let $S_1, \cdots, S_\kappa$ denote the *list* of rows of S (where some of the rows, or even all of them, may be empty). Let the rightmost box of S_i be filled with $C_i \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4)_+$. If S_i is empty, we define $C_i = |m - i| \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4)_+$ (this is the filling of the rightmost box of the $(t+i)$-th row of $T_m(\rho)$, provided that $t \neq 0$ (otherwise $S = T_m(\rho)$, in which case this row is empty by assumption)). Define γ_i, for $i = 1, \ldots, \kappa$, as the unique nonnegative integer of parity type ε nearest to $2C_i \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/2)_+$.

This determines a set of pairs of nonnegative integers (of opposite parity) (α_i, β_i), and a set of nonnegative integers γ_j uniquely. Observe that these integers are mutually distinct.

Now we form the *descending* list $\jmath$ of the numbers $(\alpha_i,\ \beta_i)$ (for $i = 1, \ldots, t$) and the γ_j (for $j = 1, \ldots, \kappa$). Observe that the length of $\jmath$ is at least κ (namely, we have at least the numbers γ_j for $i = 1, \ldots, \kappa$ in our list). Finally we define $\lambda := 2\jmath + \mathbf{1}$. Observe that λ has distinct, odd parts, and that δ (the parity of κ) is also the parity of the number of parts of λ.

We can als form the *descending* list e of the numbers $(\alpha_i - 1/2)/2$ the $(\beta_i - 1/2)/2$ (for $i = 1, \ldots, t$) and the $(\gamma_j - 1/2)/2$ (for $j = 1, \ldots, \kappa$). Observe that the list e may contain at most one negative number as an entry, namely $-1/4$. Then $\jmath = 2\mathsf{e} + 1/2$, and the list $|\mathsf{e}|$ of absolute values of e is the list consisting of the fillings of arms (the A_i) and feet (the B_i) of the m-hooks H_i of $T_m(\rho)$ (for $i = 1, \ldots, t$), combined with the list of the C_j (for $j = 1, \ldots, \kappa$).

Theorem 4.2. *The operations* $\mathsf{E} : \mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{odd,dist}} \to \mathsf{R}$ *and* $\mathsf{D} : \mathsf{R} \to \mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{odd,dist}}$ *are inverse bijections.*

We will not give the formal proof (which is not hard, see [Fe2]). Instead, we will give some illustrative examples.

Example 4.3. Let us give some examples of the operator D:

(1) Let $m = 1/4$ and ρ be zero. Then λ is zero as well. On the other hand, if $m = 3/4$ and ρ is zero, then we have no m-hooks, but since $\kappa = 1$ and $\varepsilon = 0$, we have one empty strip S_1, which yields $C_1 = 1/4$, and $\gamma_1 = 0$. Hence $\mathsf{e} = (-1/4)$,

and $\lambda = [1]$.

(2) Let $m = 15/4$ and ρ be the zero partition. Then $m = 4 - 1/4$ gives $\kappa = 4$ and $\varepsilon = 0$. We have no m-hooks, and $\kappa = 4$ strips which are all empty. Hence $C_1 = m-1 = 11/4$, $C_2 = m-2 = 7/4$, $C_3 = m-3 = 3/4$ and $C_4 = |m-4| = 1/4$, and thus $\gamma_1 = 6$, $\gamma_2 = 4$, $\gamma_1 = 2$, $\gamma_1 = 0$. So $\mathsf{e} = (11/4, 7/4, 3/4, -1/4)$. We obtain the odd distinct partition $\lambda = [1, 5, 9, 13]$ (let us agree that we may also denote a partition in increasing order, using square brackets as delimiters).

(3) For a singelton $\boxed{m} = \boxed{1/4}$ we have $\kappa = 0, \varepsilon = 1$. Hence we have one hook, and no strips (even no empty ones!). We find that $\mathsf{e} = (1/4, -1/4)$; thus we get $\lambda = [1, 3]$.

(4) Consider the following tableau:

$$\begin{array}{|c|}\hline 5/4 \\ \hline 1/4 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Here $m = 5/4 = 1+1/4$. Therefore $\kappa = 1$ and $\varepsilon = 1$. We have one m-hook, and one empty strip. Thus $(A_1, B_1) = (5/4, 1/4)$, and $((\alpha_1 - 1/2)/2, (\beta_1 - 1/2)/2) = (5/4, -1/4)$. In addition the empty strip S_1 yields $C_1 = |m-1| = 1/4$, and thus $\gamma_1 = 1$. Thus we form the descending list $\mathsf{e} = (5/4, 1/4, -1/4)$ and recover the odd distinct partition $\lambda = [1, 3, 7]$.

5. The multiplicity of odd cyclotomic polynomials

A remarkable property of cuspidal unipotent formal degrees of unramified unitary, orthogonal or symplectic groups is that these formal degrees have no odd cyclotomic polynomial factors in the numerator or the denominator (in the normalization of Haar measures we discussed before). This turns out to be a very selective property for unipotent discrete series characters of these classical groups. In the present section we will use a reduction argument and the extra-special STMs to limit the possible discrete Kazhdan-Lusztig-Langlands parameters of those unipotent discrete series characters whose formal degrees have this property, in the cases of unitary, symplectic and orthogonal groups (the types I to VI).

Notation. For a strict positive interger n we denote $\Phi_n(q) = \prod_{s|n}(1-q^s)^{\mu(n/s)}$ the *n-th cyclotomic polynomial*, with $\mu(\cdot)$ the Möbius function, defined by the rule below:

$$\mu(a) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a = 1, \\ (-1)^l, & \text{if } a \text{ is the product of } l \text{ different primes}, \\ 0, & \text{if } a \text{ contains a square factor.} \end{cases}$$

All cyclotomic polynomials belong to the free abelian group $\mathbf{M}$ (see Section 2) and form a linearly independent set in $\mathbf{M}$. The subgroup of $\mathbf{M}_{ev}$ generated by the *even* cyclotomic polynomials Φ_{2n} with $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ is equal to the subgroup generated by the polynomials $(1+q^{\star})$ with $\star \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$. Note also that $\Phi_n(q^2) = \Phi_{2n}(q)$ if n is even, while $\Phi_n(q^2) = \Phi_{2n}(q)\Phi_n(q)$ if n is odd. Therefore, for all $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$, the congruence relation $\Phi_n(q^2) \equiv \Phi_n(q) \pmod{\mathbf{M}_{ev}}$ holds in $\mathbf{M}$.

5.1. **Reduction to "real infinitesimal" central character.** Recall the notion of m-tableau (see Section 4) associated with a given pair (m,ρ) where $m \in \mathbf{Q}$ and $\rho \vdash n$ (here $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$). To (m,ρ) we associate the $W_0(\mathrm{B}_n)$-orbit of content vectors $W_0(\mathrm{B}_n)\xi(m,\rho) \in \mathbf{Q}^n$. This is the set of vectors $\xi(m,\rho)$ in $\mathbf{Q}^n$ such that the list of absolute values of coordinates of $\xi(m,\rho)$ coincides with the list of box fillings of $T_m(\rho)$ (counted with multiplicity).[2]

We say that ρ is *m-regular* if a content vector $\xi(m,\rho)$ is an *m-linear residual point* for the root system B_n, in the sense of [HO]. Equivalently, ρ is m-regular if and only if $W_0(\mathrm{B}_n)\xi(m,\rho)$ is the central character of a discrete series character of the graded affine Hecke algebra $\mathbb{H}_m(\mathrm{B}_n)$ of the root system B_n, with parameter 1 of the roots $\pm x_i \pm x_j$ and m for the roots $\pm x_i$ ([Op1, OS]).

Given a "base" $\mathbf{q}^{\mathfrak{b}}$ (with $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbf{R}_+$, and $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$) and a pair (m,ρ) as above, we form a set of vectors $W_0(\mathrm{B}_n)\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m;\rho)}(\mathbf{q})$ with $\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m;\rho)}(\mathbf{q}) = (\mathbf{q}^{\mathfrak{b}c_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{q}^{\mathfrak{b}c_n}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Here we denote by $\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b};m,\rho)} := \exp(\mathfrak{b}k\xi(m,\rho))$ the generic residual point with coordinates $(q^{\mathfrak{b}c_1}, \ldots, q^{\mathfrak{b}c_n})$, where $\xi(m,\rho) = (c_1, \ldots, c_n)$ is the m-linear residual point whose coordinates are the fillings of the boxes of $T_m(\rho)$ (ordered arbitrarily), and $k = \log(q)$. To lessen the burden of notation, we will often suppress the parameters m and $\mathfrak{b}$ from the notation, and simply write $\mathtt{r}_\rho$ instead of $\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m;\rho)}$ or even of $\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m;\rho)}(\mathbf{q})$ if there is little danger of confusion.

Recall from [OS] that the central character of a discrete series character of an affine Hecke algebra of type $\mathrm{C}_n(m_-,m_+)[\mathbf{q}^{\mathfrak{b}}]$ can always be represented as the $W_0(\mathrm{B}_n)$-orbit of a *residual point* $\mathtt{r}_{(\rho_-,\rho_+)} := (-\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m_-;\rho_-)}(\mathbf{q}), \mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m_+;\rho_+)}(\mathbf{q}))$, where $\rho_\pm$ denotes an $m_\pm$-regular partition of $n_\pm$, with $n_- + n_+ = n$. We will always assume (without loss of generality) that $m > 0$, that $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$, $m_\pm \in \mathbf{Q}_+$ are such that $\mathfrak{b}(m_+ + m_-) \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathfrak{b}(m_+ - m_-) \in \mathbf{Z}$. This assumption is satisfied for unipotent affine Hecke algebras, and guarantees that all factors in the μ function are of the form $(1 \pm q^n)$ with $n \in \mathbf{Z}$.

We recall (see [HO, Slo]) that for $m \notin \{0, 1/2, 1.\ldots, n-1\}$, all partitions $\rho \vdash n$ are m-regular, implying that the set of W_0-orbits of the m-linear residual points in this situation is in canonical bijection to the set of all partitions $\rho \vdash n$ of n.

This is the case for example for type V and type VI classical unipotent affine Hecke algebras.

But for $m \in (\mathbf{Z}/2)_{\geq 0}$ (for all classical unipotent affine Hecke algebras of type I to IV, both $m_\pm$ are in this set) not all partitions $\rho \vdash n$ are generic, in general. Slooten [Slo] has devised a general and uniform notion of a generalized "distinguished unipotent class" in order to parameterize the set of W_0-orbits of the m-linear residual points in the cases as well. The generalized distinguished unipotent classes for $m \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ are partitions λ of $2n + m^2$ with distinct *odd* parts, and with length at least m. For $m \in (\mathbf{Z} + 1/2)_{\geq 0}$ they are partitions λ of $2n + m^2 - 1/4 = 2n + \lfloor m^2 \rfloor$, with distinct *even* parts, of length at least $m - 1/2 = \lfloor m \rfloor$. If $\lambda \vdash 2n + \lfloor m^2 \rfloor$ is a distinguished unipotent m-class, then there exists a corresponding nonempty set of partitions $\rho \vdash n$ whose sets of content vectors $\xi(m, \rho)$ are equal and form a $W_0(B_n)$-orbit of m-linear residual points whose *jump sequence* ([HO, Slo]) is equal to $(\lambda - \mathbf{1})/2$. This characterizes Slooten's parameterization alluded to above.

---

[2] Here the root system B_n is realized as the set of linear functionals on $\mathbf{Q}^n$ formed by $\pm x_i$ (with $i = 1, \ldots, n$), and $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ the standard coordinates together with the set $\pm x_i \pm x_j$ (with $i \neq j$).

Given a distinguished unipotent m-class $\lambda \vdash 2n + \lfloor m^2 \rfloor$ and a corresponding partition $\rho \vdash n$ we will, by abuse of notation, often write $\mathtt{r}_{(m,\lambda)}$ instead of $\mathtt{r}_{(m,\rho)}$.

Recall that $\mathbf{M} \subset \mathbf{K}^\times$ is a free abelian group. Let $\mathbf{M}_0 \subset \mathbf{M}$ be the subgroup generated by $\mathbf{Q}^\times$ and the (linearly independent) set $\{\Phi_n \mid n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}\}$ of cyclotomic polynomials. When we speak of the multiplicity of a cyclotomic polynomial Φ_n in an element $f \in \mathbf{M}_0$ we simply mean the *exponent* $\mathrm{cycl}_f(n/2)$ of Φ_n as an irreducible factor of f. Hence cycl_f is a $\mathbf{Z}$-valued function with finite support on $(\mathbf{Z}/2)_+$. (We apologize to the reader for this convention to divide the argument of cycl by 2, but this turns out to be convenient in the context of this paper.) If we say "f does not contain Φ_n as a factor", we mean that $\mathrm{cycl}(n/2) = 0$.

By Möbius inversion, $\{q^n - 1 \mid n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}\}$ is also a linearly independent set in $\mathbf{M}_0$, which generates the same subgroup as $\{\Phi_n \mid n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}\}$. We define a $\mathbf{Z}$-valued function mult_f with finite support on $(\mathbf{Z}/2)_+$ such that $\mathrm{mult}_f(n/2)$ is the exponent of $q^n - 1$ if we express f as a product of a constant and powers of elements of $\{q^l - 1 \mid l \geq 1\}$. If $k \in (\mathbf{Z} + 1/2)_+$, the multiplicity $\mathrm{cycl}(k)$ of the odd cyclotomic factor Φ_{2k} in f can be expressed in terms of the multiplicities $\mathrm{mult}(k')$ of the factors $(1 - q^{2k'})$ in f as follows:

$$\mathrm{cycl}(k) = \sum_{s \geq 1} \mathrm{mult}(sk). \tag{5.1}$$

We suppress the subscript f in mult_f and cycl_f, if there is no danger of confusion.

Recall the normalization of the trace

$$\tau_{m_-,m_+}(1) = d^0_{m_-,m_+} \cdot (v^{\mathfrak{b}} - v^{-\mathfrak{b}})^{-n}$$

of a unipotent affine Hecke algebra $(\mathcal{H}^n_{m_-,m_+}, \tau_{m_-,m_+})$ of type I to VI. It contains only one odd cyclotomic polynomial with nonzero multiplicity, namely Φ_1 has multiplicity $-n$. As a consequence we have the following obvious but important observation: Modulo *even* cyclotomic polynomial factors, rational constants and powers of q, we have a factorization:

$$f := \mu^{n,\{\mathtt{r}_{(\rho_-,\rho_+)}\}}_{m_-,m_+} \equiv \mu^{n_-,\{\mathtt{r}_{0,\rho_-}\}}_{m_+,m_-}(\mathtt{r}_{0,\rho_-})\mu^{n_+,\{\mathtt{r}_{0,\rho_+}\}}_{m_-,m_+}(\mathtt{r}_{0,\rho_+}) := f_- f_+ \tag{5.2}$$

Clearly, if the multiplicity of all odd cyclotomic polynomials in both factors on the right hand side is zero then the same thing is true on the left hand side. Remarkably, for classical unipotent affine Hecke algebras of type I to VI, the converse is also true:

Proposition 5.1. *Let* $\mathtt{r}_{(\rho_-,\rho_+)}$ *be a residual point for a classical unipotent affine Hecke algebra* $(\mathcal{H}^n_{m_-,m_+}, \tau_{m_-,m_+})$ *of type* I *to* VI. *If the support* $\mathrm{Supp}(\mathrm{cycl}_{f_\pm})$ *of* $\mathrm{cycl}_{f_\pm}$ *is not* *contained in* $\mathbf{Z}$ *for at least one of* f_- *or* f_+*, let* $p_\pm + 1/2 \in \mathrm{Supp}(\mathrm{cycl}_{f_\pm}) \cap (\mathbf{Z} + 1/2)$ *denote the maximal element. In this case we have:*

$$\mathrm{cycl}_{f_\pm}(p_\pm + 1/2) > 0,$$

In particular the support of cycl_f *is not contained in* $\mathbf{Z}$ *in this situation either, and if* $p + 1/2 \in \mathrm{Supp}(\mathrm{cycl}_f) \cap (\mathbf{Z} + 1/2)$ *is the maximal element, then* $\mathrm{cycl}_f(p + 1/2) > 0$*.*

Consequently, if the left hand side of (5.2) has no odd cyclotomic polynomial factors, *then the same is true for the two factors on the right hand side of (5.2).*

In other words, the property of having no odd cyclotomic polynomial factors reduces to discrete series central characters $W_0(\mathrm{B}_{n_\pm})(\mathtt{r}_{0,\rho_\pm})$ with “real infinitesimal” central character. We also point out the obvious fact that:

$$\mu_{m_\mp,m_\pm}^{n_\pm,\{\mathtt{r}_{0,\rho_\pm}\}}(\mathtt{r}_{0,\rho_\pm}) \equiv \mu_{m'_\mp,m_\pm}^{n_\pm,\{\mathtt{r}_{0,\rho_\pm}\}}(\mathtt{r}_{0,\rho_\pm}) \tag{5.3}$$

modulo even cyclotomic factors, for any choice of $m'_\mp \in \mathbf{Z}/4$ such that the pair $(m'_\mp, m_\pm)$ also belongs to a type I to IV, whose base parameter $\mathfrak{b}'$ of $(m'_\mp, m_\pm)$ is the same as for $(m_\mp, m_\pm)$ (thus $\mathfrak{b}' = \mathfrak{b}$). We often choose $m_\mp$ as small as possible. For example, for the types V and VI we choose $m_\mp = 1/4$, so that the expressions to analyze are both of the form $\mu_{1/4,m}^{n,\{\mathtt{r}_{0,\rho}\}}(\mathtt{r}_{0,\rho})$ with appropriate values for m and ρ.

From here onward we may thus concentrate on the individual factors of the right hand side of (5.2), provided that we prove this positivity assertion on odd cyclotomic multiplicities for these factors, of course. *We will omit the subscripts ± while we are focusing on these individual factors* (actually, the indication ± will be used a lot below, but with entirely different meanings). We will also ignore powers of q and rational constants since we are only interested in the q-rational factors (thus we can replace all factors of the form $(1 - q^a)$ by $(1 - q^{|a|})$).

5.2. **Reduction by standard STMs.** The existence of the standard STMs is treated in [Op3, Fe1, Fe2]. We will use them as a tool for the task at hand. Firstly, let us breifly discuss the effect of standard STMs on the level of μ-function, in terms of residual points and parameters $m_\pm$.

In Section 3 we have recalled that from [Op2, Definition 5.10], given a (standard) STM

$$\Psi : \mathcal{H}^r_{(m_-,m_+)} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^l_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}$$

of classical affine Hecke algebras of types I to VI, we have a corresponding morphism on the spectra of the centers of the corresponding Hecke algebras

$$\Psi_Z : \mathtt{Spec}\mathcal{Z}^r_{(m_-,m_+)} \to \mathtt{Spec}\mathcal{Z}^l_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}$$

which essentially preserves the formal degree [Op2, Theorem 6.11]. Explicitly, given a $\mathtt{r}_{(\rho_-,\rho_+)} = (-\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b}_1,m_-;\rho_-)}, \mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b}_1,m_+;\rho_+)})$ residual points of $\mathcal{H}^r_{(m_-,m_+)}$, there exists a unique orbit of residual points $W_{2,0}\mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}$ of $\mathcal{H}^l_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}$ such that

$$\Psi_Z(W_{1,0}\mathtt{r}_{(\rho_-,\rho_+)}) = W_{2,0}\mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)},$$

where we may choose $\mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}$ in the standard form: $\mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)} = (-\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b}_2,\delta_-;\lambda_-)}, \mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b}_2,\delta_+;\lambda_+)})$.

The main property of STMs (*loc.cit.*) implies the equality of residues:

$$\mu_{\delta_-,\delta_+}^{\{\mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}\}}(\mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}) = c.\mu_{m_-,m_+}^{\{\mathtt{r}_{(\rho_-,\rho_+)}\}}(\mathtt{r}_{(\rho_-,\rho_+)}) \tag{5.4}$$

for some constant $c \in \mathbf{Q}^\times$. In this way we can analyze the q-rational parts of the formal degrees of $\mathcal{H}^l_{\delta_-,\delta_+}$ on either side. Since we have enough standard STMs to map all unipotent Hecke algebras to a minimal object of $\mathfrak{C}_{class}$, we may conclude that:

Proposition 5.2. *In order to prove Proposition 5.1 it suffices to prove this Proposition for the minimal objects of* (3.5)*.*

For a standard translation STM Ψ [Op3, Section 3.2.6], the action of Ψ_Z on Weyl group orbits of residual points is very simple when we use Slooten's parameterization of such orbits in terms of "unipotent partitions". Namely, if (λ_-,λ_+) is a pair of unipotent partitions with parameters (m_-,m_+) of type I, II, III or IV, and Ψ translates this parameter pair to a pair (m'_-,m'_+), then (λ_-,λ_+) is also a pair of unipotent partitions for the pair (m'_-,m'_+), and

$$\Psi_Z(W_0(-\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m_-;\lambda_-)},\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m_+;\lambda_+)})) = W'_0(-\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m'_-;\lambda_-)},\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m'_+;\lambda_+)})$$

Such standard translation STMs exist whenever the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) $m_\pm \in \mathbf{Z}/2$,
(ii) $m'_\pm$ lies between $m_\pm$ and 0,
(iii) $m_\pm - m'_\pm \in \mathbf{Z}$ if $m_\pm \in \mathbf{Z}+1/2$, and $m_\pm - m'_\pm \in 2\mathbf{Z}$ if $m_\pm \in \mathbf{Z}$.

Apart from these translation STMs we have the spectral isomorphisms, which are generated by two isomorphisms which have the following effect on the orbits of residue points in their standard presentations:

$$\eta(W_0(-\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m_-;\lambda_-)},\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m_+;\lambda_+)})) = W_0(-\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m_+;\lambda_+)},\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m_-;\lambda_-)})$$

and

$$\eta_+(W_0(-\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m_-;\lambda_-)},\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m_+;\lambda_+)})) = W_0(-\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},m_-;\lambda_-)},\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},-m_+;\lambda'_+)})$$

(where λ'_+ is the conjugate of λ_+).

Finally there are extra special standard STMs, whose action on the residual points involves the bijections described by the extra special algorithms. Let (m_-,m_+) be a pair of parameters of type V or VI, and $\rho_\pm$ partitions of $r_\pm$ such that $r = r_- + r_+$. By the extra special algorithm, we have integers $\delta_\pm$ and partitions $\lambda_\pm$ for every input $(m_\pm,\rho_\pm)$, and there exists a unique extra special standard STM $\Psi^e : \mathcal{H}^r_{(m_-,m_+)} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^l_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}$. Thus

$$\Psi^e_Z(W_{1,0}(-\mathtt{r}_{(2,m_-;\rho_-)},\mathtt{r}_{(2,m_+;\rho_+)})) = W_{2,0}(-\mathtt{r}_{(1,\delta_-;\lambda_-)},\mathtt{r}_{(1,\delta_+;\lambda_+)})$$

It is a very important fact (a consequence of the above, and the extra special bijections) that every pair $((\delta_-,\lambda_-),(\delta_+,\lambda_+))$ arises in the image of a suitable extra special STM.

Consider types involving $m \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ (i.e. types I, III, IV), a minimal object has parameters (δ_-,δ_+) in the set $\{(0,1/2),(1/2,1),(0,1),(0,0),(1,1)\}$, hence at least one of $\delta_\pm$ is in $\{0,1\}$. Say $\delta \in \{0,1\}$, and let $\lambda \vdash 2n+\delta$ be a partition with odd, distinct parts. Let

$$(m,\rho) \leftrightarrow (\delta,\lambda)$$

correspond each other through the extra-special algorithm, where the left pair is expressed as an m-tableau $T_m(\rho)$, and λ is an odd distinct partition whose number of parts is congruent to δ modulo 2.

As mentioned above, *all* residue points of the form $\mathtt{r}_{(0,\lambda)} = \mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b}=1,\delta;\lambda)}$ are the image under an appropriate extra-special STM $\Psi : \mathcal{H}^r_{(1/4,m)} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^n_{(0,\delta)}$ of a residue point of the form $\mathtt{r}_{(2,m_+;\rho_+)}$. Instead of analyzing formal degrees for the parameters $(0,\delta)$ (with $\mathfrak{b}=1$) we can analyze the situation for the *generic* parameters $(1/4,m)$ (with $\mathfrak{b}=2$), and this turns out to be an important simplification.

By the above reductions, in order to prove Proposition 5.1, it suffices to show that:

Proposition 5.3. *For all pairs (m,ρ) with $\rho \vdash n$ a partition (possibly zero) and $m \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4)_+$ such that $\mu_{1/4,m}^{n,\{\mathtt{r}_{(0,\rho)}\}}(\mathtt{r}_{0,\rho})$ has odd cyclotomic polynomial factors Φ_{2p+1} with nonzero multiplicity, the multiplicity of the odd cyclotomic polynomial Φ_{2p_m+1} with $p_m \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ maximal such that Φ_{2p_m+1} has nonzero multiplicity in $\mu_{1/4,m}^{n,\{\mathtt{r}_{(0,\rho)}\}}(\mathtt{r}_{(0,\rho)})$ appears with* positive *multiplicity.*

The same statement is true for all $1/2$-unipotent classes $\lambda \vdash 2n$ (i.e. $\lambda \vdash 2n$ has even, distinct parts), and factors of the form Φ_{2p+1} of $\mu_{1/2,1/2}^{n,\{\mathtt{r}_{(0,\lambda)}\}}(\mathtt{r}_{(0,\lambda)})$.

The proof of Proposition 5.3, hence of Proposition 5.1, as well as the classification of pairs (m,ρ) (with $m \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4)_+$ and $\rho \vdash n \geq 0$) and $1/2$-unipotent classes λ for which no odd cyclotomic polynomials appear as a factor, will now be given in separate sections.

5.3. **Counting odd cyclotomic polynomials for the case $\delta = 1/2$.** Let $\lambda \vdash 2n$ be a partition with even, distinct parts, and let $\rho \vdash n$ be a partition of n such that the content vector $\xi(1/2,\rho)$ of the $1/2$-tableau $T_{1/2}(\rho)$ has jump sequence $(\lambda - \mathbf{1})/2$. Let $h : (\mathbf{Z}+1/2)_+ \to \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ denote the associated multiplicity function, that is, for all $k \in (\mathbf{Z}+1/2)_+$ the number of boxes in $T_{1/2}(\rho)$ with filling k equals $h(k)$. Recall from [HO, Section 4] that such a function h defining a linear residual point for $R_0 = \mathrm{B}_n$ and $m = 1/2$, is characterized by the following two conditions:

(A) Let p be the largest half integral number in the support of h. Then $h(p) = 1$.
(B) For all $x \geq 1/2$ we have $h(x) \in \{h(x+1), h(x+1)+1\}$.

Let $\mathtt{r} := (\emptyset, \mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b}=1,1/2;\lambda)})$ be the corresponding positive residual point for $\mathcal{H}^n_{(1/2,1/2)}$.

Lemma 5.4. *The rational function $\mu_{1/2,1/2}^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$ in q contains no odd cyclotomic polynomials if and only if h is given by*

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} p - x + 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq p \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

If h is not of the form (5.5) then the highest odd cyclotomic polynomial factor Φ_{2j+1} of $\mu_{1/2,1/2}^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$ appears in the numerator of $\mu_{1/2,1/2}^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$.

Proof. Assume that $\mu_{1/2,1/2}^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$ contains no odd cyclotomic polynomial factors. We ignore powers of q and rational constants, allowing us to rewrite all factors in the form $(1-q^k)$ with $k > 0$ (and we ignore factors of the form $(1+q^\star)$, since these only involve even cyclotomic factors). These factors are linearly independent over $\mathbf{Z}$ in the abelian group $\mathbf{K}^\times$, and thus have a well defined multiplicity $\mathrm{mult}(k)$ in $\mu_{1/2,1/2}^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$.

Assume that $p = 2k \pm 1/2$ and that $0 \leq i < k-1$. A simple book-keeping using (2.4) (with l replaced by n) determines $\mathrm{mult}(2p-2i)$ in terms of h as follows (the inequality $2p - 2i \geq p + 3/2$ insures that only the roots $(t_x t_y)^{\pm 1}$ (with possibly $x = y$) contribute to this multiplicity):

$$\begin{aligned}\text{(5.6)}\quad \mathrm{mult}(2p-2i) &= h(p-i)\,(h(p-i) - h(p-i-1) + 1)\\ &\quad + \sum_{x=1}^{i} h(p-i+x)\,(2h(p-i-x) - h(p-i-1-x) - h(p-i+1-x))\end{aligned}$$

Since $2p - 2i \geq p + 3/2$, and since all factors of the form $(1 - q^k)$ of $\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$ have order less or equal $2p+1$, it is clear that $\mathrm{mult}(2p-2i)$ represents the multiplicity of the odd cyclotomic polynomial Φ_{2p-2i} as an irreducible factor of $\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$. By assumption this multiplicity must therefore be equal to 0.

For $i = 0$, the equation $\mathrm{mult}(2p) = 0$ combined with (A) implies that

$$h(p-1) = 2.$$

Hence (5.5) holds for all $x > p-2$. Now suppose by induction that (5.5) holds for all $x > p-2j$ for some integer $1 \leq j \leq k-1$. Using this induction hypothesis we see that all summands of $\mathrm{mult}(2p-2j)$ for $x \leq j-2$ vanish, while $\mathrm{mult}(2p-2j) = 2j+2-h(p-2j-1)$. Hence we have $h(p-2j-1) = 2j+2$, which implies, in view of (B) and $h(p-2j+1) = 2j$, that

$$h(p-2j) = 2j+1.$$

Hence we find that (5.5) holds for all $x > p-2j-2$ as well. By induction this proves that h satisfies (5.5) if $p = 2k - 1/2$ for some nonnegative integer k, and it shows that (5.5) is satisfied for all $x > 1/2$ if p is of the form $p = 2k + 1/2$. And we see that if h does not satisfy (5.5) in this range of values for x then the numerator of $\mu_{1/2,1/2}^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$ has a odd cyclotomic polynomial.

Finally, for $p = 2k + 1/2$ we need to rule out the possibility that $h(1/2) = p - 1/2$. So assume that $h(1/2) = p - 1/2$. We compute the multiplicity of the odd cyclotomic polynomial $\Phi_{p+1/2} = \Phi_{2k+1}$, but now $h(1/2)$ of the roots of the form $t_x t_y^{-1}$ also contribute in the denominator. To compute this multiplicity, the easiest method is to compare $\mu_{1/2,1/2}^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$ with the analogous product $\mu_{1/2,1/2}^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}'\})}$, where this time $\mathtt{r}'$ has one extra coordinate equal to $q^{1/2}$ compared to $\mathtt{r}$. We already know that the multiplicity of $\Phi_{p+1/2}$ in $\mu_{1/2,1/2}^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}'\})}$ is 0 since h' (the multiplicity function of $\mathtt{r}'$) does satisfy (5.5). The difference with the multiplicity of $\Phi_{p+1/2}$ in $\mu_{1/2,1/2}^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$ consists of 2 extra factors in the numerator (coming from a factor of the form $(1 - q^{1/2}q^p)^2$) and 3 more in the denominator (one coming from $(1 - qq^pq^{-1/2})$ and two from $(1 - qq^{p-1}q^{1/2})$). Hence the multiplicity of $\Phi_{p+1/2}$ in

$\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{1/2,1/2}$ is 1, which violates our assumption.

To sum up, we have shown in all cases that if h does not satisfy (5.5) then highest odd cyclotomic polynomial Φ_{2j+1} (where we order the cyclotomic polynomials by the order of their associated roots) of $\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{1/2,1/2}$ will be a factor of the numerator. $\square$

Corollary 5.5. *For $\delta = 1/2$, there exists a positive residual point $\mathtt{r}$ such that $\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{1/2,1/2}$ contains no odd cyclotomic polynomials if, and only if, $n = r(r+1)/2$ for some $r \geq 1$. In this case $\mathtt{r} = \mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b}=1,1/2;\lambda)}$, where $\lambda = [2r, 2r-2, 2r-4, \ldots, 2] \vdash 2n = r(r+1)$. This residual point represents a cuspidal STM $\mathcal{H}^{0}_{1/2,m} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^{n}_{1/2,1/2}$ where $m = r + 1/2$.*

Define $a, b \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ by $\{2a, 2b+1\} = \{r, r+1\}$. If r is even, then $a = b = r/2$, and if r is odd, then $a = (r+1)/2$ and $b = (r-1)/2$. Then $\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{1/2,1/2} = d^{0}_{1/2,m} = d^{\mathrm{D}}_{a}(q)d^{\mathrm{B}}_{b}(q)$. Let π be the corresponding cuspidal unipotent representation. Then π is a representation of $\mathbf{SO}_{2n+1}(k)$ if $n = r(r+1)/2$ with $r \equiv 0, 3 \pmod 4$, and π is a representation of the nontrivial inner form of $\mathbf{SO}_{2n+1}(k)$ if $r \equiv 1, 2 \pmod 4$.

Remark 5.6. *Observe the following relation between h as in Lemma 5.4 and $\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{1/2,1/2}$:*

$$\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{1/2,1/2} = \prod_{k \in \mathbf{Z}_{+}} (1+q^{k})^{-(h(k+1/2)+h(k-1/2))}.$$

5.4. Counting odd cyclotomic polynomial factors in the case $m \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4)_{+}$.

Recall that to a pair (m, ρ) with a partition ρ and parameter $m \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4)_{+}$ we attached the linear residual point ξ whose coordinates are the fillings of the boxes of $T_m(\rho)$. Recall (cf. [OS, Sections 6,7,8, especially Theorem 8.7]) that the W_0-orbits of $\mathbf{L}$-generic residual points of $\mathcal{H}^{r}_{1/4,m_{+}}$ are in natural bijection with partitions ρ of r. A representative in the W_0 orbit of residual points is given by $\mathtt{r}_{\rho} := \exp(2k\xi)$ with $k = \log(q)$ (see Subsection 5.1).

Via the extra special algorithm we get the corresponding odd distinct partition λ. This gives rise to a residue point $\mathtt{r}_{\lambda}$ of $\mathcal{H}^{l}_{0,\delta_{+}}$ (cf. *loc.cit.* , or [Slo]). The coordinates of $\mathtt{r}_{\lambda}$ are given by $\exp(\xi)$, where ξ is a linear residual point whose coordinates are given by k times the fillings of the boxes of a δ-tableau $T_{\delta}(\Lambda)$ where Λ is a partition such that the tableau $T_{\delta}(\Lambda)$ has distinct δ-extremities (in the sense of [Slo]) which are equal to $(\lambda - \mathbf{1})/2$. (Such Λ always exist, and the orbit $W_0\mathtt{r}_{\lambda}$ does not depend on the choices of such Λ.)

5.5. Reduction to certain rectangular diagrams.

Given a pair (m, ρ) with $m \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4)_{+}$ and $\rho \vdash r$ a partition, let us introduce some notations associated to $T_m(\rho)$.

We denote the entries of the upper-left, upper-right and lower-left cornered boxes of $T_m(\rho)$ by m, p_{+}, p_{-} respectively. Note that $p_{+} \geq m$ and $p_{+} - m \in \mathbf{Z}$. Let $a_m \in [0, 1)$ be determined by $m - a_m \in \mathbf{Z}$. Then the a_m-diagonal inside the m-tableau indicates the change of congruence classes of the entries modulo $\mathbf{Z}$. So, all entries of $T_m(\rho)$ are in the same congruence class modulo $\mathbf{Z}$ if and only if $p_{-} - m \in \mathbf{Z}$. Denote the entry of the last box below p_{+} by r_{+}, and the entry of the last box horizontal to the right of p_{-} by r_{-}. Below is an example of an m-tableau with $p_{+} = 15/4, m = 3/4 = a_m, p_{-} = 9/4$ and $r_{+} = 7/4, r_{-} = 5/4$.

3/4	7/4	11/4	15/4
1/4	3/4	7/4	11/4
5/4	1/4	3/4	7/4
9/4	5/4		

We will now study the *odd* cyclotomic polynomial factors in the q-rational part of residues $\mu_{1/4,m}^{r,\{\mathbf{r}_{0,\rho}\}}(\mathbf{r}_{0,\rho})$ of $\mu_{1/4,m}^{r}$ at a positive (or "infinitesimally real") residue point $\mathbf{r}_{0,\rho}$. Since we neglect even cyclotomic polynomials of the regularized value of $\mu_{1/4,m}^{r}$, after substitution of $(t_1,\dots,t_r)$ by $\mathbf{r}_\rho$ (whose coordinates all are odd powers of v) we can replace $\mu_{1/4,m}^{r}$ by the following product (as usual, up to rational constants, powers of v, and characters of T):

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{1/4,m}^{r} &\equiv (1-q)^{-r}\prod_{1\le i<j\le n}\frac{(1-t_it_j)^2(1-t_it_j^{-1})^2}{(1-q^2t_it_j)(1-q^{-2}t_it_j)(1-q^2t_it_j^{-1})(1-q^{-2}t_it_j^{-1})}\times\\ &\prod_{z=1}^{n}\frac{(1-t_z^2)^2}{(1-q^{2m}t_z)(1-q^{-2m}t_z)}\quad(\mathrm{mod}\ \mathbf{M}_{ev})\end{aligned}\tag{5.7}$$

Recall that the coordinates of $\mathbf{r}_\rho$ are of the form $v^{4x}=q^{2x}$ where $x\in\mathbf{Z}\pm 1/4$. Since we are only interested in $|x|$, and since the Weyl group allows us to change signs, we may and will choose $\mathbf{r}_\rho$ in such a way that all its coordinates are of the form q^{2x} with $x>0$. We remark however that the congruence class modulo $\mathbf{Z}$ of x and $-x$ are distinct. This is a key fact in all that follows.

We choose Weyl group elements $w_\pm$ such that $w_\pm(\mathbf{r}_\rho)$ has all its coordinates of the form v^{4x} with $x \pmod{\mathbf{Z}} = \pm m$. Then the multiplicity $h_\pm(x)$ of v^{4x} in $w(\mathbf{r}_\rho)$ is *independent* of the choice of $w_\pm$. This defines two multiplicity functions $h_\pm:\mathbf{Z}\pm m\to\mathbf{Z}_{\ge 0}$ which satisfy the obvious relation $h_-(x)=h_+(-x)$ for all x.

The coordinates of $w_+(\mathbf{r}_\rho)$ are the contents of the boxes of $T_\rho(m,+)$, which is **defined** as the Young tableau of ρ with its boxes above or on the a_m-diagonal filled like those of $T_\rho(m)$, but below the a_m-diagonal we multiply the contents of the boxes of $T_\rho(m)$ by -1. Similarly, we **define** $T_\rho(m,-)$ by multiplying the content of the boxes of $T_\rho(m)$ above or on the a_m-diagonal by -1, leaving the boxes below the a_m diagonal unchanged. Hence the multiplicity of the coordinate q^{2x} in $w_\pm(\mathbf{r}_\rho)$ is equal to the length of the x-diagonal in $T_\rho(m,\pm)$.

Remark 5.7. *We introduce the following convention. Given* $m\in(\mathbf{Z}\pm 1/4)_+$*, for* $x\in\mathbf{Z}\pm 1/4$ *we adopt the notation* $x^\pm$ *to denote the unique element* $x^\pm\in\{-x,x\}$ *such that* $x^\pm\in\mathbf{Z}\pm m$*. For example,* $m^\pm=\pm m$*, and we always have* $p_+^+=p_+$*.*

Now we will analyze the multiplicity functions $\mathrm{mult}:=\mathrm{mult}_f$ and $\mathrm{cycl}(k):=\mathrm{cycl}_f(k)$ for $f=\mu_{1/4,m}^{r,\{\mathbf{r}_{0,\rho}\}}(\mathbf{r}_{0,\rho})$, and $k\ge(p_++p_-)/4$. Let $k\in\mathbf{Z}_{\ge 0}+3/2$ (we use $3/2$ here, and not $1/2$, because this turns out to be more convenient, and since our normalization of

Haar measures makes sure that the factor $\Phi_1 = q-1$ has multiplicity 0 in the formal degree of any discrete series character). We will need to consider the functions $\mathrm{mult}(dk)$ for $d = 1,\ 2$ or $d = 4$. As seen below, we distinguish between various contributions, coming from factors associated to different types of roots:

- $\mathrm{mult}_+(k)$ and $\mathrm{mult}_-(k)$: For the function $\mathrm{mult}_\pm(k)$ we take into consideration the contribution to $(1-q^{2k})$ from the $(1-t_it_j)^2$-terms in the numerator, where $t_i,\ t_j$ are coordinates of $w_\pm(\mathtt{r}_\rho)$ (hence $t_i = q^{2x}$, $t_j = q^{2y}$ and x, y are both in the congruence class of $m \pmod{\mathbf{Z}}$ or $-m \pmod{\mathbf{Z}}$), the factors $(1-q^2t_it_j)$ and $(1-q^{-2}t_it_j)$ in the denominator for such t_i, t_j, as well as the factors $(1-t_z^2)^2$.

  In this way, any (unordered) pair of boxes of $T_\rho(m,\pm)$ with contents x and y such that $x+y \geq 3/2$ contributes $+2$ to $\mathrm{mult}_+(x+y)$ and -1 to $\mathrm{mult}_+(x+y+1)$ and $\mathrm{mult}_+(x+y-1)$. Moreover, every single box of $T_m(\rho)$ contributes $+2$ to $\mathrm{mult}_+(2x)$. Note that the maximal entry $p_\pm$ occurs only once in $T_m(\rho)$ (for p_- we need to assume $p_-^- = p_-$ here). This implies in all cases easily that $\mathrm{mult}_\pm(k) = 0$ for $k \geq 2p_\pm$.

- $\mathrm{mult}_{+,-}(2k)$: Consider factors of the form $(1-q^{4k}) = (1-q^{2k})(1+q^{2k})$, where $4k$ equals twice an odd number. In $\mathrm{mult}_{+,-}(2k)$, we count such factors of $\mu_{1/4,m}^{r,\{\mathtt{r}_{0,\rho}\}}(\mathtt{r}_{0,\rho})$ arising from type D-roots, via factors of the form $(1-t_it_j)^2$ (in the numerator) or $(1-q^2t_it_j)$ or $1-q^{-2}t_it_j)$ (both in the denominator), with t_i a coordinate of $w_+(\mathtt{r}_\rho)$, and t_j a coordinate of $w_-(\mathtt{r}_\rho)$.

  In such terms, the pair $\{i,j\}$ corresponds to a pair of boxes, one with entry x^+ of $T_m(\rho,+)$ and one with entry y^- of $T_m(\rho,-)$, thus in different congruence classes modulo $\mathbf{Z}$. (If $T_m(\rho)$ contains entires below the a_m-diagonal, then x^+ is on or above the a_m-diagonal, and y^- is below that diagonal in $T_m(\rho)$.) In the numerator terms we need that $2k = x^+ + y^-$ is an *odd* integer.

  Then $t_i = q^{2x^+}$ is a coordinate of $w_+(\mathtt{r}_\rho)$, and $t_j = q^{2y^-}$ is a coordinate of $w_-(\mathtt{r}_\rho)$. The cardinality of the set of unordered pairs $\{i,j\}$ such that the corresponding coordinate pair $\{t_i,t_j\}$ of $\mathtt{r}_\rho$ satisfies $\{t_i,t_j\} = \{q^{2x^+}, q^{2y^-}\}$ (with $x^+ + y^-$ *odd*) is $h_+(x^+)h_-(y^-)$. Each such pair contributes $+2$ to $\mathrm{mult}_{+,-}(x^+ + y^-)$. On the other hand, an unordered pair of such boxes with $x^+ + y^-$ *even* contributes -1 to $\mathrm{mult}_{+,-}(x^+ + y^- - 1)$ and to $\mathrm{mult}_{+,-}(x^+ + y^- + 1)$. Notice that $\mathrm{mult}_{+,-}(2k) = 0$ if $2k > p_+ + p_-^-$, for obvious reasons.

- $\mathrm{mult}_{+,-}(4k)$: Similar as for $\mathrm{mult}_{+,-}(2k)$, but now counting the multiplicity of the factors of the form $(1-q^{8k}) = (1+q^{4k})(1+q^{2k})(1-q^{2k})$, where $8k$ is four times an odd number. For factors in the numerator we are thus searching x, y such that $4k = x^+ + y^- \equiv 2 \pmod 4$. In the denominator terms we should solve $4k = x^+ + y^- \pm 1 \equiv 2 \pmod 4$. (Since our overall assumption will be that $4k \geq (p_+ + p_-)$, $\mathrm{mult}_{+,-}(4k)$ is possibly nonzero only for the smallest values of k in our range, depending on the congruence class of $p_+ + p_-$ modulo 4.)

- The terms $-h_\pm(k \mp m)$, coming from the denominator in the second line of (5.7), as well as the possible contributions from this denominator to $(1-q^{2k})$ via a contribution to $(1-q^{4k})$ and $(1-q^{8k})$, in other words the terms $-h_{\pm}(2k\pm m)$ and $-h_{\pm}(4k\pm m)$.

To sum up, we have for $k\in(\mathbf{Z}+1/2)_+$:

$$\mathrm{mult}(k):=(\mathrm{mult}_+(k)-h_+(k-m))+(\mathrm{mult}_-(k)-h_-(k+m)) \tag{5.8}$$

while for $n\in\mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ we have:

$$\mathrm{mult}(n):=(\mathrm{mult}_{+,-}(n)-h_-(n-m))-h_+(n+m) \tag{5.9}$$

We shall now compute each of these functions in terms of h_- and h_+. Note that both $2p_+-k$ and $2p_--k$ are integers since $p_+,p_-\in\mathbf{Z}\pm1/4$ and $k\in(\mathbf{Z}_++1/2)_+$. First look at the factors

$$\frac{(1-t_it_j)^2}{(1-q^2t_it_j)(1-q^{-2}t_it_j)}.$$

To find out the multiplicity $\mathrm{mult}_+(k)$ of the factor $(1-q^{2k})$, we separate two cases, based on the parity of $2p_+-k$.

Case (i): $2p_+-k=2i$ is even. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{mult}_+(k)\\ =&2\sum_{x=1}^{i}h_+(p_+-i+x)h_+(p_+-i-x)+2\times\frac{1}{2}h_+(p_+-i)[h_+(p_+-i)-1]+2h_+(p_+-i)\\ &-\sum_{x=1}^{i}h_+(p_+-i+x)h_+(p_+-i-x+1)-\sum_{x=0}^{i}h_+(p_+-i+x)h_+(p_+-i-x-1).\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

Because of $t_it_j=q^{2(c(i)+c(j))}$ with $i<j$, we need to count twice the multiplicities of the entries in the Young diagram whose sum is k (corresponding to $(1-t_it_j)^2$), an subtract once those with sum $k+1$ (corresponding to $1-q^2t_it_j$) and similar for $k-1$ (corresponding to $1-q^{-2}t_it_j$). For the first case we add the terms $2h_+(x)h_+(y)$ for (x,y) a solution to $x+y=k$ with $p_+\geq x\geq y$ and $x,y\equiv p_+ \pmod{\mathbf{Z}}$. The solutions to this equation yield the first 2 terms in the formula (the second term corresponds to $x=y=k/2=p-i$). The third term corresponds to the factor $(1-t_z^2)^2$ in the μ-function. The last two terms correspond to the factor $(1-q^2t_it_j)(1-q^{-2}t_it_j)$.

We introduce the Δ-operator which is defined by

$$\Delta h(x)=2h(x)-h(x+1)-h(x-1), \tag{5.11}$$

and the "jump function" for all x:

$$J_{\pm}(x)=h_{\pm}(x)-h_{\pm}(x+1)\in\{-1,0,1\}. \tag{5.12}$$

With these notations we can rewrite the formula of $\mathrm{mult}_+(k)$ neatly (if $k=2p_+-2i$):

$$\mathrm{mult}_+(k)=\sum_{x=1}^{i}h_+(p_+-i+x)\Delta h_+(p_+-i-x)+h_+(p_+-i)[1-J_+(p_+-i-1)].$$

Case (ii): $2p_+ - k = 2i - 1$ is odd. In this case for the numerator we lose the terms corresponding to $(k/2, k/2)$ because of parity, and also $(1-t_z^2)^2$ does not contribute because of parity. But for the denominator we have the contributions corresponding to (x, y) with $x = y = (k+1)/2$ and $x = y = (k-1)/2$. So the formula becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{mult}_+(k)\\
=&2\sum_{x=1}^{i} h_+(p_+ - i + x)h_+(p_+ - i - x + 1)\\
&-\sum_{x=1}^{i} h_+(p_+ - i + x)h_+(p_+ - i - x) - \frac{1}{2}h_+(p_+ - i)[h_+(p_+ - i) - 1]\\
&-\sum_{x=1}^{i-1} h_+(p_+ - i + x + 1)h_+(p_+ - i - x + 1) - \frac{1}{2}h_+(p_+ - i + 1)[h_+(p_+ - i + 1) - 1]
\end{aligned}$$

Using Δ and $J_\pm$ we can rewrite this formula as (for $k = 2p_+ - 2i + 1$)

$$\mathrm{mult}_+(k) = \sum_{x=1}^{i} h_+(p_+ - i + x)\Delta h_+(p_+ - i - x + 1) + \frac{1}{2}[h_+(p_+ - i + 1) + h_+(p_+ - i)][1 - J_+(p_+ - i)].$$

For all $k \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0} + \frac{3}{2}$ we can formally write

$$\mathrm{mult}_+(k) = \sum_{\substack{x+y=k,\ p_+ \geq x > y\\ x \equiv y \equiv m \pmod{\mathbf{Z}}}} h_+(x)\Delta h_+(y) + R_+(k) =: M_+(k) + R_+(k), \tag{5.13}$$

where the "remainder" $R_+(k)$ denotes the term which is not in the summation symbol of the above formulae. *Observe that* $R_+(k) \geq 0$.

By virtue of symmetry we obtain the formula of $\mathrm{mult}_-(k)$ from the formula of $\mathrm{mult}_+(k)$ by replacing $+$ by $-$. But it is important to observe here that the contributions of $(1-t_z^2)^2$ of the form $(1-q^{2k})$ with $k \equiv 2m \pmod{2\mathbf{Z}}$ contribute to $\mathrm{mult}_+(k)$, while those with $k \equiv -2m \pmod{2\mathbf{Z}}$ contribute to $\mathrm{mult}_-(k)$. Together this we have used all such contibutions coming from this factor of the μ-function exactly once. Hence we may write

$$\mathrm{mult}_-(k) = \sum_{\substack{x+y=k,\ p_- \geq x > y\\ x \equiv y \equiv -m \pmod{\mathbf{Z}}}} h_-(x)\Delta h_-(y) + R_-(k), \tag{5.14}$$

with $R_-(k) \geq 0$.

Remark. Observe that $J_-(x) + J_+(-x-1) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4$.

Next, we consider the term

$$\frac{(1 - t_i t_j)^2}{(1 - q^2 t_i t_j)(1 - q^{-2} t_i t_j)}.$$

where we take t_i and t_j from opposite congruence classes modulo $\mathbf{Z}$. Then $c(i)+c(j) \in \mathbf{Z}$. The contribution to an odd cyclotomic factor $(1-q^{2k})$ (with $2k \in 2\mathbf{Z}+1$) from terms of this kind comes from their contribution to the factor of the form $1-q^{2(c(i)+c(j)}$ with $c(i)+c(j) = 2k$ or $4k$ (and not k, because $c(i)+c(j) \in \mathbf{Z}$ now). This readily yields:

$$\text{mult}_{+,-}(2k) = \sum_{\substack{a+b=2k \\ a-m,\, b+m \in \mathbf{Z}}} h_+(a)\Delta h_-(b) = \sum_{\substack{a+b=2k \\ a-m,\, b+m \in \mathbf{Z}}} \Delta h_+(a)\, h_-(b). \tag{5.15}$$

The second equality holds by symmetry.

Finally, in our range $k \geq (p_+ + p_-)/4$, we need to subtract the multiplicity of the odd cyclotomic polynomials occurring in the factors $(1-q^{2k})$, $(1-q^{4k})$ and $(1-q^{8k})$ appearing in the denominator of the factors

$$\frac{1}{(1-q^{2m}t_z)(1-q^{-2m}t_z)}.$$

This yields 12 contributions to $\text{mult}(k)$: $-h_\pm(k \mp m)$, $-h_\pm(2k \pm m)$ and $-h_\pm(4k \pm m)$.

Now we turn to give criterion for $\text{cycl}(k) = 0$.

Lemma 5.8. *Assume that* (m, ρ) *(with* ρ *a partition of the rank* r*) is such that for the odd cyclotomic factors of* $f = \mu_{1/4,m}^{r,\{\mathbf{r}_{0,\rho}\}}(\mathbf{r}_{0,\rho})$ *we have* $\text{cycl}(k) = 0$ *for all* $k \in (\mathbf{Z}+1/2)_+$ *and* $k > p_+$. *If* $r = 1$ *then* $m = 1/4$. *Otherwise* $T_m(\rho)$ *contains boxes below the* a_m*-diagonal (so* $p_-^- = p_-$ *if* $r > 1$*).*

Proof. If $r = 1$ then $f \equiv (q-1)^{-1}(q^{4m}-1)$ modulo even cyclotomic factors. Hence unless $4m = 1$ we have $\text{cycl}(2m) = 1$ and $k = 2m > p_+ = m$, contradicting the assumption.

Suppose that $r > 1$, and that $T_m(\rho)$ has no entires below the a_m-diagonal. Put $k = p_+ + r_+ \in (\mathbf{Z}+1/2)_+$. Now $\text{mult}_+(k) - h_+(k-m) \geq 1$ by (5.13) (use that $\Delta(h_+)(r_+) \geq 1$ and that $\Delta(h_+)(m) \geq 1$, and that for all y such that $r_+ < y \leq p_+$ and $y \neq m$, we have $\Delta(h_+)(y) = 0$). Since clearly $2k > p_+ + p_-^-$, we thus have $\text{mult}_{+,-}(sk) = 0$ for all $s \geq 0$. Also $2k \pm m > p_+ > p_-^-$, so $h_\pm(2k \pm m) = 0$, and $k + m > p_-^-$ so $h_-(k+m) = 0$. Hence (5.1), (5.8), (5.9) imply that $\text{cycl}(k) = \text{mult}(k) > 0$, contradicting the assumption. □

Corollary 5.9. *Assume* (m, ρ) *as in Lemma 5.8, and* $r > 1$. *Then* $p_+ + p_- \geq 1$. *If* $k \in (\mathbf{Z}+1/2)_+$ *satisfies* $\text{mult}(2k) \neq 0$ *then* $k \leq (p_+ + p_- + 1)/2$ *if* $p_+ + p_- \in \mathbf{Z}$ *is even, and* $k \leq (p_+ + p_-)/2$ *otherwise.*

Proof. If $r > 1$ then $p_-^- = p_-$, i.e. p_- is in a different class modulo $\mathbf{Z}$ than p_+. It is immediate that $p_+ + p_- \geq 1$. Looking at (5.9), (5.15) we see easily that for k above the indicated bounds, $\text{mult}(2k) = 0$ (use that $p_+ \geq m$, and that $p_-^- = p_-$). □

Lemma 5.10. *Assume that* (m, ρ) *is as in Lemma 5.8, and* $r > 1$. *Then* $p_+ > p_-$.

Proof. We have already shown that p_+ and p_- are in different classes modulo $\mathbf{Z}$. Assume on the contrary that $p_- > p_+$. If r_- would be below the a_m-diagonal too, then (5.14) implies that for $k = p_- + r_- > p_- > p_+$ we have $(\text{mult}_-(k) - h_-(k+m)) > 0$. But by the previous Corollary, $\text{mult}(2k) = 0$ because $p_- + r_- > (p_+ + p_-)/2$ by our assumption. By (5.1), (5.8), (5.9) our assumption $\text{cycl}(k) = 0$ implies that $\text{mult}_+(k) - h_+(k-m) < 0$.

But from (5.13) it then follows that $k' = p_+ + r_+ \geq k$, because k' is the largest argument such that $\mathrm{mult}_+(k') - h_+(k'-m) \neq 0$. As we have seen, $\mathrm{mult}_+(k') - h_+(k'-m) > 0$, and the considerations above concerning the other terms in $\mathrm{cycl}(k)$ hold *a fortiori* for $k' > k$. Thus $\mathrm{cycl}(k') > 0$, a contradiction. Hence we conclude that r_- has to be above the a_m-diagonal. This implies that the largest part $p_+ - m + 1$ of ρ must be at least $p_- + a_m + 1$, since this is now smaller than or equal to the length of the smallest part of ρ. Thus $p_+ \geq p_- + a_m + m > p_-$, contradiction. □

Lemma 5.11. *Assume that* (m, ρ) *is such that* $\mathrm{cycl}(k) = 0$ *for all* $k \in (\mathbf{Z} + 1/2)_+$ *with* $k \geq (p_+ + p_-)/4$*. Then all parts of* ρ *are equal, i.e. the tableau* $T_m(\rho)$ *is rectangular.*

Proof. Clearly we may assume without loss of generality that $r > 1$. Assume first that r_+ is above the a_m-diagonal. Put $k_1^+ := p_+ + r_+$, (the notation $k_1^\pm$ is not to be confused with the notation $x^\pm$ for $x \in \mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4$ as in Remark 5.7), then $\mathrm{mult}_+(k_1^+) - h_+(k_1^+ - m) > 0$. It follows from (5.9) that the largest argument k' for which $\mathrm{mult}(k') \neq 0$ is either k_1^+ or $k_1^- := p_- + r_-^-$ if $k_1^- > k_1^+$. In any case, $k_1 := \max\{k_1^+, k_1^-\} \geq k_1^+ = p_+ + r_+ > (p_+ + p_-)/2$ (the inequality follows from Lemma 5.10), and $\mathrm{mult}(k_1) > 0$.

Our assumption $\mathrm{cycl}(k_1) = 0$ and (5.1) now force that $\mathrm{mult}(2k_1) \neq 0$. Corollary 5.9 then implies that $k_1 \leq (p_+ + p_- + 1)/2$ (if $p_+ + p_-$ is even) or $k_1 \leq (p_+ + p_-)/2$ (if $p_+ + p_-$ is odd). In the second case we reach a contradiction with the above, so we conclude that $p_+ + p_-$ is even, and that $k_1 = k_1^+ = (p_+ + p_- + 1)/2$. Then (5.9) and (5.15) imply that $\mathrm{mult}(2k_1) = (\mathrm{mult}(2k_1) - h_-(2k_1 - m)) \leq h_-(2k_1 - p_+ - 1) = 1$, so that $k_1^+ = k_1^-$ is not allowed (since that would imply that $\mathrm{mult}(k_1) = 2$, so that $\mathrm{cycl}(k_1) \geq 1$, a contradiction). Thus $k_1^- < k_1^+$.

Now notice that $2k_1^+ = 2p_+ + 2r_+ = p_+ + p_- + 1$, implying that $p_+ + 2r_+ = p_- + 1$, so that $0 < 2r_+ = 1 + p_- - p_+ < 1$. It follows that $r_+ = 1/4$, and $p_+ = p_- + 1/2$. Suppose now that r_- is still below the $a_m = 1/4$-diagonal, then $r_- \geq 3/4$ and $k_1^- = p_- + r_- \geq p_+ + 1/4 = k_1^+$, contradicting our earlier conclusion that $k_1^- < k_1^+$. Thus r_- must be above the $a_m = 1/4$-diagonal, and in fact we must have $r_- = r_+ = 1/4$. We finally conclude that $T_m(\rho)$ is a square diagram with $m = 1/4$, and $p_+ = n + 1/4$, $p_- = n - 1/4$ and $r_- = r_+ = 1/4$. This finishes the case where r_+ is above the diagonal.

Next assume that r_+ is below the a_m-diagonal. Then r_- is below the a_m-diagonal as well. *This implies in particular that either* $r_- = r_+$ *(which is what we want to show) or otherwise* $r_- - r_+ \geq 2$.

We have seen that the largest argument k_1 for which $\mathrm{mult}(k_1) > 0$ is $k_1 = \max\{k_1^+, k_1^-\}$, where this time (because of the congruence classes of r_- and r_+ modulo $\mathbf{Z}$) $k_1^+ = p_+ - r_+$ and $k_1^- = p_- + r_-$. Since $\mathrm{cycl}(k_1) = 0$ we must have that $\mathrm{mult}(2k_1) \neq 0$, which implies by Corollary 5.9 that $k_1 \leq (p_+ + p_- + 1)/2$ (if $p_+ + p_-$ is even) and $k_1 \leq (p_+ + p_-)/2$ (if $p_+ + p_-$ is odd) as before. We note that $\mathrm{mult}(p_+ + p_- + 1) = 1$ in the first case ($p_+ + p_-$ even), while $\mathrm{mult}(p_+ + p_-) = 2$ in the second case. Assume that $p_+ + p_-$ is even. Then $p_+ + p_- + (r_- - r_+) = k_1^+ + k_1^- \leq 2k_1 \leq p_+ + p_- + 1$. Thus $r_+ = r_-$, as we intended to show. Next assume that $p_+ + p_-$ is odd. Then $p_+ + p_- + (r_- - r_+) = k_1^+ + k_1^- \leq 2k_1 \leq p_+ + p_-$. Again it follows that $r_- = r_+$, and we are done. □

Corollary 5.12. *In the notations of the proof of Lemma 5.11, put* $r_- = r_+ := r$*. We have* $m \geq r$*, and* $r \equiv m \pmod{\mathbf{Z}}$ *if and only if* $m = r = 1/4$*.*

Proof. It was shown in the proof of Lemma 5.11 that $r \equiv m \pmod{\mathbf{Z}}$ implies that $m = r = 1/4$. If $r \not\equiv m \pmod{\mathbf{Z}}$ then Lemma 5.8 and Lemma 5.11 imply that $p_- \equiv r \pmod{\mathbf{Z}}$, and by Lemma 5.11 it follows that $p_+ - m = p_- - r$, or $m - r = p_+ - p_-$. The assertion now follows from Lemma 5.10. □

Theorem 5.13. *Assume that* (m, ρ) *is such that* $\mathrm{cycl}(k) = 0$ *for all* $k \in (\mathbf{Z}+1/2)_+$ *with* $k \geq (p_+ + p_-)/4$. *Then* (m, ρ) *is one of the following possibilities:*

(a) m *is arbitrary and* ρ *is zero.*
(b) $m = 1/4$ *and* ρ *is a square diagram, so that* $r_- = r_+ = 1/4$.
(c) $m = 3/4$, *and* ρ *is a rectangular diagram such that* $r_- = r_+ = 1/4$. *In this case we can write* $p_+ = n + 3/4$, $p_- = n + 1/4$ *for some* $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$.
(d) $m = 5/4$, *and* ρ *is a rectangular diagram such that* $r_- = r_+ = 3/4$. *In this case we can write* $p_+ = 2n + 5/4$, $p_- = 2n + 3/4$ *for some* $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$.
(e) $m = 7/4$, *and* ρ *is a rectangular diagram such that* $r_- = r_+ = 1/4$. *In this case we can write* $p_+ = 2n + 7/4$, $p_- = 2n + 1/4$ *for some* $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

If (m, ρ) *does not belong to any of these cases, the largest* $k_{(m,\rho)} \in \mathbf{Z} + 1/2$ *for which* $\mathrm{cycl}(k_{(m,\rho)}) \neq 0$ *should satisfy* $k \geq (p_+ + p_-)/4$. *In that case we will have* $\mathrm{cycl}(k_{(m,\rho)}) > 0$.

Proof. We have seen in the proof of Lemma 5.11 that if ρ is not zero and r_+ is above the a_m-diagonal, then we are in case (b).

Hence we now assume that ρ is not zero and $r := r_+ = r_-$ is below the a_m-diagonal. We are left with the task of proving that we are in one of the cases (c) to (e).

Since we are assuming $k \geq (p_+ + p_-)/4$, we see that $\mathrm{cycl}(k) = \mathrm{mult}(k) + \mathrm{mult}(2k) + \mathrm{mult}(3k) + \mathrm{mult}(4k)$. For the same reason, we see that $\mathrm{cycl}(3k) = \mathrm{mult}(3k) = 0$ (the latter equality holds by assumption). Hence

$$\mathrm{cycl}(k) = \mathrm{mult}(k) + \mathrm{mult}(2k) + \mathrm{mult}(4k). \tag{5.16}$$

We will see that $\mathrm{mult}(k)$ for $k \geq 1/2$ is given by the remarkably simple explicit formula (5.17), and that $\mathrm{mult}(k) \geq 0$. In the proof below we analyze the implications of the *requirement* that $\mathrm{mult}(2k) + \mathrm{mult}(4k)$ cancels $\mathrm{mult}(k)$ for $k \geq (p_- + p_+)/4$.

Following the steps and notations of the proof of Lemma 5.11 we put $k_1 = \max\{k_1^-, k_1^+\}$, with $k_1^\pm = p_\pm \mp r$. Then k_1 is the largest argument for which $\mathrm{mult}(k_1) \neq 0$. Using (5.13), (5.14), and (5.8) the rectangular shape of $T_m(\rho)$ implies that for all $k \geq 1/2$:

$$\mathrm{mult}(k) = h_+(k + r) + h_-(k - r) \geq 0. \tag{5.17}$$

The simplicity of this formula is somewhat deceptive. One uses that $\Delta(h_\pm)(y) = 1$ if $y = \pm m$ or $y = \mp r$, $\Delta(h_\pm)(y) = -1$ if $y = \pm(p_+ + 1)$ or $y = \mp(p_- + 1)$, and $\Delta(h_\pm)(y) = 0$ otherwise. For example, to see that $\mathrm{mult}_+(k) - h_+(k - m) = h_+(k + r)$ for all $k \geq 1/2$, one checks that for $k > 2m$ we have

$$M_+(k) := h_+(k - m) + h_+(k + r) - h_+(k + p_- + 1) = h_+(k - m) + h_+(k + r)$$

and $R_+(k) = 0$; for $m - r < k \leq 2m$ we have

$$M_+(k) := h_+(k + r) - h_+(k + p_- + 1) = h_+(k + r),$$

and $R_+(k) = h_+(m) = h_+(k - m)$; while for $1/2 \leq k \leq m - r$ we have $M_+(k) = h_+(k + r) - h_+(k + p_- + 1)$ and $R_+(k) = h_+(m)$, where we observe that $h_+(k - m) =$

$h_+(m) - h_+(k + p_- + 1)$. Similar observations apply to show that

$$\mathrm{mult}_-(k) - h_-(k + m) = h_-(k - r).$$

The function $h_+(k + r)$ is zero for $k > k_1^+ = p_+ - r$, then equals the linear function $1 + k_1^+ - k$ for $m - r \leq k \leq k_1^+ + 1$, and then is constant for $1/2 \leq k \leq m - r$.

The function $h_-(k - r)$ is zero for $k > k_1^- = p_- + r$, then equals the linear function $1 + k_1^- - k$ for $2r \leq k \leq k_1^- + 1$, and then is constant for $1/2 \leq k \leq 2r$.

Let us now look at mult$(2k)$. By (5.9) and (5.15) we have in the rectangular case:

$$\mathrm{mult}(2k) = \mathrm{mult}_{+,-}(2k) - h_-(2k - m) - h_+(2k + m) = -h_-(2k - p_+ - 1)$$

for all $k \geq (p_+ + p_-)/4$. Here we used that $h_+(2k + m) = 0$ if $k \geq (p_- + p_+)/4$, because $(p_- + p_+)/2 + m = p_+ + (m + r)/2 > p_+$. To describe the function mult$(2k)$ in this range, we distinguish the following cases for later reference.

(a) $p_+ + p_-$ and $p_+ + r$ are both even. Then the function mult$(2k)$ is zero for $k > (p_+ + p_- + 1)/2$, it equals the positive linear function $2k - 2 - p_+ - p_-$ for $k_2^a =: (p_+ + r + 1)/2 \leq k \leq (p_+ + p_- + 1)/2 := k_2$, and is constant for $(p_+ + p_-)/4 \leq k \leq (p_+ + r + 1)/2 := k_2^b$ (so $k_2^b = k_2^a$ here).

(b) $p_+ + p_-$ even and $p_+ + r$ odd. Then the function mult$(2k)$ is zero for $k > (p_+ + p_- + 1)/2$, it equals the positive linear function $2k - 2 - p_+ - p_-$ for $k_2^a =: (p_+ + r + 2)/2 \leq k \leq (p_+ + p_- + 1)/2 := k_2$, and is constant for $(p_+ + p_-)/4 \leq k \leq (p_+ + r)/2 := k_2^b$ (so $k_2^b = k_2^a - 1$ here).

(c) $p_+ + p_-$ odd and $p_+ + r$ even. Then the function mult$(2k)$ is zero for $k > (p_+ + p_-)/2$, it equals the positive linear function $2k - 2 - p_+ - p_-$ for $k_2^a =: (p_+ + r + 1)/2 \leq k \leq (p_+ + p_-)/2 := k_2$, and is constant for $(p_+ + p_-)/4 \leq k \leq (p_+ + r + 1)/2 := k_2^b$ (so $k_2^b = k_2^a$ here).

(d) $p_+ + p_-$ and $p_+ + r$ are both odd. Then the function mult$(2k)$ is zero for $k > (p_+ + p_-)/2$, it equals the positive linear function $2k - 2 - p_+ - p_-$ for $k_2^a =: (p_+ + r + 2)/2 \leq k \leq (p_+ + p_-)/2 := k_2$, and is constant for $(p_+ + p_-)/4 \leq k \leq (p_+ + r)/2 := k_2^b$ (so $k_2^b = k_2^a - 1$ here).

We will also need to consider the largest value $k_4 \in \mathbf{Z} + 1/2$ such that mult$(4k_4) \neq 0$, assuming that this k_4 satisfies $k_4 \geq (p_+ + p_-)/4$. By (5.15) we have:

$$\mathrm{mult}(4k) = (\mathrm{mult}_{+,-}(4k) - h_-(4k - m)) = -h_-(4k - p_+ - 1)$$

Hence the summand mult$(4k)$ is possibly nonzero only for the smallest values of k in the range $k \geq (p_+ + p_-)/4$, since $h_-(4k - p_+ - 1) \neq 0$ implies that $4k \leq p_+ + p_- + 1$. Considering that $4k_4 = 2 \pmod 4$ we make this more precise: Let k_4 be the largest $k \in (\mathbf{Z} + 1/2)_+$ for which mult$(4k_4) \neq 0$.

(i) If $p_+ + p_- = 1 \pmod 4$ then $k_4 = (p_+ + p_- + 1)/4$, and mult$(4k_4) = -1$;
(ii) If $p_+ + p_- = 2 \pmod 4$ then $k_4 = (p_+ + p_-)/4$, and mult$(4k_4) = -h_-(p_- - 1)$;
(iii) If $p_+ + p_- = 0 \pmod 4$ then $k_4 = (p_+ + p_- - 2)/4$, (and so is not in our range);
(iv) If $p_+ + p_- = 3 \pmod 4$ then $k_4 = (p_+ + p_- - 1)/4$, (and so is not in our range);

We see that always $k_2 > k_4$, and k_4 is either not in our range or it is the smallest argument in our range.

A function defined on $\mathbf{Z}+1/2$ is the restriction of a unique continuous piecewise linear function on $\mathbb{R}$ whose intervals of linearity have end points in $\mathbf{Z}+1/2$. For $\mathrm{mult}(2k)$ we distinguish the following “events” $k_2, k_2^a, k_2^b \in (\mathbf{Z}+1/2)_+$: It is zero for $k > k_2$, it is negative and linear on $[k_2^a, k_2]$, and it is constant again on $[k_4, k_2^b]$, with $0 \leq k_2^a - k_2^b \leq 1$.

We define $k_2^c \in \mathbf{Z}+1/2$ to be the largest argument such that $\mathrm{mult}(2k_2^c)$ is strictly larger than the value of the linear function $l_2(k) := 2k - 2 - p_+ - p_-$ at k_2^c describing $\mathrm{mult}(2k)$ on the interval $[k_2^a, k_2]$. Then $k_2^c = k_2^a - 1$ in cases (a) and (c), while $k_2^c = k_2^b$ in cases (b) and (d). We define the $\mathrm{mult}(2k)$-*deficit* $d_2 = \mathrm{mult}(2k_2^c) - l_2(k_2^c) > 0$ *at* k_2^c to be the difference between $\mathrm{mult}(2k_2^c)$ and this linear expression evaluated at k_2^c. Hence the deficit equals 2 for the cases (a) and (c), and 1 for the cases (b) and (d).

It is immediate that *the condition* $\mathrm{cycl}(k) = 0$ *for all* $k \geq (p_+ + p_-)/4$ *forces that* $k_1 := \max\{k_1^+, k_1^-\} = k_2$. Notice that we also have $k_1^+ + k_1^- = 2k_2 - 1$ in the cases (a) and (b), and $k_1^+ + k_1^- = 2k_2$ in the cases (c) and (d). Hence in the cases (a) and (b) we have $|k_1^+ - k_1^-| = 1$, while for the cases (c) and (d) we have $k_1^+ = k_1^-$. We see that in these cases, the linear expression representing $\mathrm{mult}(k)$ just below k_1, cancels the linear expression of $\mathrm{mult}(2k)$ just below k_2. *We also see that if* $k_1 \neq k_2$*, then* $k_1 > k_2$*, and thus* $\mathrm{cycl}(k_1) = \mathrm{mult}(k_1) > 0$.

We denote by k_1^c the largest argument for which there is a positive deficit $d_1 = \ell_1(k_1^c) - \mathrm{mult}(k_1^c) > 0$ between $\mathrm{mult}(k)$ and the linear expression ℓ_1 valid for $\mathrm{mult}(k)$ with $k_1^c < k \leq k_1 + 1$. From the analysis below (5.17), we see that $k_1^c = \min(m-r, 2r) - 1$, and that $d_1 = 2$ if $m - r = 2r$, while $d_1 = 1$ else. We now have more possibilities to distinguish.

(a’) As in case (a), where we impose in addition that $k_1^+ = k_1^- + 1 = k_1 = k_2$. This implies that $k_1^\pm = p_\pm \mp r = (p_+ + p_- \pm 1)/2$, thus $p_+ - p_- = 1 + 2r = m - r$ (recall that, from the rectangular shape of $T_m(\rho)$, we have $p_+ - m = p_- - r$), so that $m = 3r + 1$. Hence $k_1^c = \min(m - r, 2r) = 2r$, with deficit $d_1 = 1$. Moreover, $k_2^c = (p_+ + r - 1)/2 = (p_+ + p_- + 4r - 1)/4$ with deficit $d_2 = 2$. Notice that $k_2^c - k_1^c = (p_+ - 3r - 1)/2 = (p_+ - m) \geq 0$.

(a”) As in case (a), where we impose in addition that $k_1^- = k_1^+ + 1 = k_1 = k_2$. This implies that $k_1^\pm = p_\pm \mp r = (p_+ + p_- \mp 1)/2$, thus $p_+ - p_- = -1 + 2r = m - r$, so that $m = 3r - 1$. Hence $k_1^c = \min(m - r, 2r) = 2r - 1$, with deficit $d_1 = 1$. Moreover, $k_2^c = (p_+ + r - 1)/2 = (p_+ + p_- + 4r - 3)/4$ with deficit $d_2 = 2$. Observe that $k_2^c - k_1^c = (p_+ - 3r + 1)/2 = (p_+ - m) \geq 0$.

(b’) As in case (b), where we impose in addition that $k_1^+ = k_1^- + 1 = k_1 = k_2$. This implies that $k_1^\pm = p_\pm \mp r = (p_+ + p_- \pm 1)/2$, thus $p_+ - p_- = 1 + 2r = m - r$, so that $m = 3r + 1$. In this case $k_1^c = \min(m - r, 2r) = 2r$, with deficit $d_1 = 1$. Moreover, $k_2^c = (p_+ + r)/2 = (p_+ + p_- + 4r + 1)/4$ with deficit $d_2 = 1$. Hence $k_2^c - k_1^c = (p_+ - 3r)/2 = (p_+ - m + 1) > 0$.

(b”) As in case (b), where we impose in addition that $k_1^- = k_1^+ + 1 = k_1 = k_2$. This implies that $k_1^\pm = p_\pm \mp r = (p_+ + p_- \mp 1)/2$, thus $p_+ - p_- = 1 + 2r = m - r$, so that $m = 3r - 1$. In this case $k_1^c = \min(m - r, 2r) = 2r - 1$ with deficit $d_1 = 1$.

Moreover, $k_2^c = (p_+ + r)/2 = (p_+ + p_- + 4r - 1)/4$ with deficit $d_2 = 1$. Hence $k_2^c - k_1^c = (p_+ - 3r + 1)/2 = (p_+ - m + 2) > 0$.

(c') As in case (c), where we impose in addition that $k_1^- = k_1^+ = k_1 = k_2$. This implies that $k_1^\pm = p_\pm \mp r = (p_+ + p_-)/2$, thus $p_+ - p_- = 2r = m - r$, so that $m = 3r$. In this case $k_1^c = 2r - 1$ with deficit $d_1 = 2$. Moreover, $k_2^c = (p_+ + r - 1)/2 = (p_+ + p_- + 4r - 2)/4$ with deficit $d_2 = 2$. Hence $k_2^c - k_1^c = (p_+ - 3r + 1)/2 = (p_+ - m + 1) > 0$.

(d') As in case (d), where we impose in addition that $k_1^- = k_1^+ = k_1 = k_2$. This implies that $k_1^\pm = p_\pm \mp r = (p_+ + p_-)/2$, thus $p_+ - p_- = 2r = m - r$, so that $m = 3r$. In this case $k_1^c = 2r - 1$ with deficit $d_1 = 2$. Moreover, $k_2^c = (p_+ + r)/2 = (p_+ + p_- + 4r)/4$ with deficit $d_2 = 1$. Hence $k_2^c - k_1^c = (p_+ - 3r + 2)/2 = (p_+ - m + 2) > 0$.

This shows that in all cases, $k_2^c \geq k_1^c$, and if $k_1^c = k_2^c$ then $d_1 < d_2$. This implies that *always* $\mathrm{mult}(k_2^c) + \mathrm{mult}(2k_2^c) > 0$ if k_2^c is in our range, i.e. if $k_2^c \geq (p_+ + p_-)/4$. Therefore, $\mathrm{cycl}(k) = 0$ for all $k \geq (p_+ + p_-)/4$ could only happen if one of the following possibilities hold: Either $k_2^c < (p_+ + p_-)/4$, or else $(p_+ + p_-)/4 \leq k_2^c \leq k_4$, and $\mathrm{cycl}(k) = (\mathrm{mult}(k_2^c) + \mathrm{mult}(2k_2^c)) + \mathrm{mult}(4k_2^c) = 0$. We have already mentioned above that $k_4 \geq (p_+ + p_-)/4$ implies that k_4 is the smallest element of $\mathbf{Z} + 1/2$ that satisfies this inequality. In other words, the second possibility mentioned is equivalent to $(p_+ + p_-)/4 \leq k_2^c = k_4$.

If $k_2^c < (p_+ + p_-)/4$, by the expressions of k_2^c in every case above, we must be in case (a") or (c') with $r = 1/4$. In the first case that would imply $m < 0$, which is absurd. In the case (c') we get a solution, with $r = 1/4$, $m = 3/4$, $p_+ = (2n-1) + 3/4$, $p_- = (2n-1) + 1/4$. This is the odd rank case of Theorem 5.13(c).

Next we analyze the case $(p_+ + p_-)/4 \leq k_2^c = k_4$. One reads off from the above list of cases that this implies that we are either in the case (i) and (d'), with $r = 1/4$, $m = 3/4$, $p_+ = 2n + 3/4$, and $p_- = 2n + 1/4$ (here $d_2 = 1 = \mathrm{mult}(k_4)$), which is the case of Theorem 5.13(c), or in case (ii) and (a'), with $r = 1/4$ and $m = 7/4$, which gives Theorem 5.13(e), or in case (ii) and (a"), with $r = 3/4$ and $m = 5/4$, which is case Theorem 5.13(d). In the latter two cases we have $d_2 = 2$, and $\mathrm{mult}(k_4) = 2$ if $k_1^c < k_2^c$, while $\mathrm{mult}(k_4) = 1 = d_1$ if $k_1^c = k_2^c$.

Observe that in the course of the proof, we also checked that if a pair (m, ρ) does not belong to one of the cases listed in Theorem 5.13(a)-(e), then there exist $k \in \mathbf{Z} + 1/2$ such that $k \geq (p_+ + p_-)/4$ and $\mathrm{cycl}(k) \neq 0$, the largest $k_{(m,\rho)}$ of which satisfies $\mathrm{cycl}(k_{(m,\rho)}) > 0$. This concludes the proof of all assertions. □

5.6. **Counting odd cyclotomic polynomial factors for the cases $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$.** As we have already explained in Subsection 5.2, the statements about odd cyclotomic factors of $\mu_{(0,\delta)}^{(\{\mathbf{r}_\lambda\})}$ follow from the results of the previous paragraph by application of the extra-special STMs. We now translate the results to the cases $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ using the extra-special bijection.

Corollary 5.14. *Suppose that $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ and let $\mathbf{r}$ be a positive residual point such that $\mu_{0,\delta}^{n,(\{\mathbf{r}\})}$ has no odd cyclotomic factors. Then $\mathbf{r}$ is of the form $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_\lambda$ with $\lambda \vdash \delta + 2n$ a partition with odd, distinct parts. The pair (δ, λ) must belong one of the following cases:*

(a) *Choose $m \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4)_+$ and define $\kappa \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}$ by writing $m = \kappa + (2\epsilon - 1)/4$. Define $\lambda = [1 + 2\epsilon, 5 + 2\epsilon, \dots, 4(\kappa - 1) + 1 + 2\epsilon]$, and $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$*

by $\kappa \equiv \delta \pmod 2$*. Define* n *by* $2n+\delta = 2\kappa^2 + (2\epsilon - 1)\kappa$*. Then* $\mathtt{r}_\lambda$ *represents a cuspidal (extra-special) unipotent STM* $\mathcal{H}^0_{1/4,m} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^n_{0,\delta}$*. In particular, modulo powers of* q *and rational constants, we have* $\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{0,\delta} = d^0_{1/4,m}$ *(with* $d^0_{1/4,m}$ *as in (3.4)), and for all these cases* $\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{0,\delta}$ *indeed has no odd cyclotomic factors.*

(b) *For* $r \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$*, put* $\lambda = [1,3,\dots,4r+1,4r+3] \vdash 2n$ *with* $n = 2(r+1)^2$*, and put* $\delta = 0$*. Then* $\mathtt{r} = \mathtt{r}_\lambda$ *represents a cuspidal unipotent STM* $\mathcal{H}^0_{0,m} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^n_{0,0}$ *with* $m = 2(r+1)$*, and* $\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{0,0} = (d^{\mathrm{D}}_a(q))^2$ *with* $a = (r+1)$*. In particular, for all these cases* $\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{0,0}$ *indeed has no odd cyclotomic factors. (Note: We consider the empty diagram with* $\delta = 0$ *as belonging to case (a).)*

(c) *For* $r \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$*, put* $\lambda = [1,3,\dots,4r+3,4r+5] \vdash 2n+1$ *with* $n = 2(r+1)(r+2)$*, and put* $\delta = 1$*. Then* $\mathtt{r} = \mathtt{r}_\lambda$ *represents a cuspidal unipotent STM* $\mathcal{H}^0_{0,m} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^n_{0,1}$ *with* $m = 2r+3$*, and* $\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{0,1} = (d^{\mathrm{B}}_b(q))^2$ *with* $b = (r+1)$*. In particular, for all these cases* $\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{0,1}$ *indeed has no odd cyclotomic factors.*

(d) *Let* $r \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$*, put* $n = 8(r+1)^2 - 1$*,* $\lambda = [3,5,7,\dots,8r+5,8r+7] \vdash 2n+1$ *and* $\delta = 1$*. In this case, modulo powers of* v *and rational constant, we have*

$$\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{0,1} = \frac{(1-q^{4(r+1)})}{(1-q)}\mu^{n+1,(\{\mathtt{r}'\})}_{0,0} = \frac{(1-q^{4(r+1)})}{(1-q)}(d^{\mathrm{D}}_a(q))^2 \tag{5.18}$$

where $\mathtt{r}' = \mathtt{r}_{\lambda'}$ *with* $\lambda' = [1,3,5,\dots,8r+7]$ *(then* $\mathtt{r}' = (1,\mathtt{r})$*), and* $a = 2(r+1)$*. In particular,* $\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{0,1}$ *has no odd cyclotomic polynomials as factors if and only if* $r = 2^s - 1$ *for some* $s \geq 0$*.*

(e) *Let* $r \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$*, put* $n = 8(r+1)^2+1$*,* $\delta = 0$*, and* $\lambda = [1,3,5,\dots,8r+5,8r+9] \vdash 2n$*. Then* $\mathtt{r}_\lambda = (\mathtt{r}_{\lambda'}, q^{4(r+1)})$*, where* $\lambda' = [1,3,5,\dots,8r+7]$*. Since* $\mathtt{r}_{\lambda'}$ *represents a standard translation morphism, we see that* $\mathtt{r}$ *is the image under the standard translation STM* $\mathcal{H}^1_{0,m} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^n_{0,0}$ *of the residual point* $t = (q^{4(r+1)})$*, where* $m = 4(r+1)$*. Consequently, modulo powers of* v *and rational constants we have:*

$$\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{0,0} = \frac{(1-q^{4(r+1)})}{(1+q^{4(r+1)})(1-q)}(d^{\mathrm{D}}_a(q))^2 \tag{5.19}$$

with $a = 2(r+1)$*. In particular,* $\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{0,0}$ *has no odd cyclotomic polynomials as factors if and only if* $r = 2^s - 1$ *for some* $s \geq 0$*.*

Together with the results of Theorem 5.13 the above results imply that in all cases, if a residue of the form $\mu^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{0,\delta}$ *or of the form* $\mu^{r,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_{1/4,m}$ *contains odd cyclotomic polynomials with nonzero multiplicity, then the highest odd cyclotomic factor which has nonzero multiplicity in the residue in fact has* positive *multiplicity.*

Proof. The last assertion follows from the expressions given in parts (a)–(e). Parts (a)–(c) follow directly from the results of Theorem 5.13 by application of the extra-special bijection and STMs. The expression for residues in terns of unipotent degrees follows from the relation between the parameters $\{a,b\}$ and $\{m_-,m_+\}$, the normalization of unipotent affine Hecke algebras, and the defining properties of STMs, as explained in Section 3 (also see [Op3]).

The results mentioned in (e) follow from an application of a standard translation STM (as explained there).

The result of (d) is obtained by a direct computation, using that the residue point $\mathtt{r}'$ represents a standard STM, and is constructed from $\mathtt{r}$ simply by adding one coordinate with the value 1. Using this, it is an easy direct computation to check the formula given in (d). □

Remark 5.15. *This finishes the proof of Proposition 5.3, and thus of Proposition 5.1.*

6. Proof of the main theorem

6.1. **Computing residues.** In the present section we will prove the main Theorem 1.6 using the techniques we have developed so far. In the course of the analysis we will need to be able to compute residues of the form

$$(\mu_{min}^{\mathcal{X}})_q^{(\{\mathtt{r}\})} := (\mu_{\delta_-,\delta_+})_q^{(\{\mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}\})} \tag{6.1}$$

where $\mathcal{X} \in \{\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{II}, \mathrm{III}, \mathrm{IV}\}$, with $\delta_\pm \in \{0, 1/2, 1\}$ and $\mathfrak{b} \in \{1, 2\}$ determined such that $\mathcal{H}_{min}^{\mathcal{X}} = \mathrm{C}_n(\delta_-, \delta_+)[q^{\mathfrak{b}}]$ (see (3.5)), and where $\mathtt{r} = \mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)} = (-\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},\delta_-;\lambda_-)}, \mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},\delta_+;\lambda_+)})$ is a C_l-residual point for these parameters, i.e. $\lambda_\pm \vdash 2n_\pm + \lfloor \delta_\pm \rfloor$ is a partition with distinct parts of parity type $2\delta_\pm - 1$, such that $n_- + n_- = n$.

Suppose that $(\mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ is a unipotent cuspidal pair of an inner form of a connected, unramified, almost absolutely simple group $G_{\mathrm{qs}} = \mathbf{G}_{\mathrm{qs}}(K)$, defined and quasi-split over k, of adjoint type in its isogeny class, for which there exists a spectral covering map $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}_{min}^{\mathcal{X}}$.

Recall (Proposition 3.7, Corollary 3.8) that it is our task to show that the set of orbits $W_0\mathtt{r}$ of residual points of $\mathcal{H}_{min}^{\mathcal{X}}$ satisfying the equation

$$(\mu_{min}^{\mathcal{X}})_q^{(\{\mathtt{r}\})} = \mathrm{fdeg}_q(\sigma) \tag{6.2}$$

consists of a single $\mathrm{Aut}_{es}(\mathcal{H}_{min}^{\mathcal{X}})$-orbit (which is then necessarily an orbit of images of standard STMs, since we already know the existence of enough standard STMs).

Recall from Section 5 that if $W_0\mathtt{r}$ is a solution of (6.2) with $\mathtt{r} = (-\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},\delta_-;\lambda_-)}, \mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},\delta_+;\lambda_+)})$, then $\lambda_\pm$ have to belong to the set of unipotent partitions described in Lemma 5.4 (for $\delta_\pm = 1/2$) or in Corollary 5.14 (for $\delta_\pm \in \{0, 1\}$). Hence it suffices to show that the assignment $W_0\mathtt{r} \to (\mu_{min}^{\mathcal{X}})_q^{(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$ is injective on this set of orbits of residual points, modulo the action of $\mathrm{Aut}_{es}(\mathcal{H}_{min}^{\mathcal{X}})$.

Define $\mathbf{M}^e \subset \mathbf{M}$ the subgroup generated by the rational constants and expressions of the form $v^k + v^{-k}$ for $k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$. For $f \in \mathbf{M}^e$, there exists a unique function $m_f^e : \mathbf{Z}_{>0} \to \mathbf{Z}$ such that modulo the subgroup of $\mathbf{K}^\times$ generated by powers of v and rational constants, we have

$$f \equiv \prod_{n \in \mathbf{Z}_+} (1 + q^n)^{m_f^e(n)} \tag{6.3}$$

Hence it makes sense, for parameters $(\mathfrak{b}; \delta_-, \delta_+)$ such that $\mathcal{H}_{min}^{\mathcal{X}} = \mathrm{C}_n(\delta_-, \delta_+)[q^{\mathfrak{b}}]$ and for distinguished unipotent partitions $\lambda_\pm$ for $\delta_\pm$ as listed in Lemma 5.4 (for $\delta_\pm = 1/2$) or in Corollary 5.14 (for $\delta_\pm \in \{0, 1\}$), to define:

Definition 6.1. *We put*

$$\mathrm{mult}_{(\mathfrak{b};\delta_-,\delta_+)}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)} = m^{e}_{(\mu_{min}^{\mathcal{X},d^0=1})(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$$

with (δ_-,δ_+) *and* $\mathfrak{b}$ *as above, and* $\mathtt{r} = (-\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},\delta_-;\lambda_-)}, \mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},\delta_+;\lambda_+)})$ *as above. Here* $\mu_{min}^{\mathcal{X},d_0=1}$ *denotes the* μ*-function of* $\mathrm{C}_n(\delta_-,\delta_+)[q^{\mathfrak{b}}]$ *normalized by* $(v^{\mathfrak{b}}-v^{-\mathfrak{b}})^{-n}$ *(the actual normalization factor is* $(v^{\mathfrak{b}}-v^{-\mathfrak{b}})^{-n}(v+v^{-1})^{-\delta_{1,\delta_-\delta_+}}$*, which has an additional factor* $d_1^{\{^2\mathrm{D}\}} = (v+v^{-1})^{-1}$ *if* $\delta_- = \delta_+ = 1$*, due to the anisotropic factor of the maximal torus of* $^2\mathrm{D}_n$*).*

6.2. **Remarks on residues at residual points with positive coordinates.** For the residue points $\mathtt{r} = \mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b}=1,\delta,\lambda)}$ with positive coordinates as listed in the above Corollary 5.14 we computed the residues $\mu_{0,\delta}^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$. We could alternatively compute the residues $\mu_{1,\delta}^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$, and for later reference we will express the relation between these two residues now, and use the opportunity to introduce some useful notations.

In general, let $\delta \in \{0, 1/2, 1\}$ and let $\lambda \vdash 2n + \lfloor\delta\rfloor$ be a distinguished unipotent partition of type δ, i.e. λ has distinct parts of parity type $1-2\delta$. Let $\mathtt{r} = \mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},\delta;\lambda)}$ be the corresponding residue point with positive coordinates.

Definition 6.2. *For* $x \in \mathbf{Q}$*, let* $\tilde{h}_{\mathfrak{b};\lambda}(x) \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ *denote the number of coordinates of* $\mathtt{r} = \mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},\delta;\lambda)}$ *equal to* q^x *or to* q^{-x}*. Note that this is independent of the choice of* $\mathtt{r}$ *in its* $W_0(\mathrm{B}_n)$*-orbit. In particular* $\tilde{h}_{\mathfrak{b};\lambda}(\mathfrak{b}x) = h_{1;\lambda}(x)$*, and* $\tilde{h}_{\mathfrak{b};\lambda}$ *is an* even *function supported on* $\mathfrak{b}(\mathbf{Z}+\delta)$*. Observe that* $\tilde{h}_{\mathfrak{b};\lambda}(0)$ *equals* twice *the number of coordinates of* $\mathtt{r}$ *which are equal to* 1*. If* $\mathfrak{b} = 1$ *then we usually drop it from the notation and simply write* $\tilde{h}_\lambda$*.*

For the residue points listed in Corollary 5.14 we restrict ourselves to $\mathfrak{b} = 1$ and $\delta \in \{0,1\}$. Then it is obvious from the definition of $\tilde{h}_\lambda$ and from (2.4) that, modulo powers of q and rational constant factors, we have:

$$\mu_{1,\delta}^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})} = \prod_{x\in\mathbf{Z}_+} (1+q^x)^{\Delta_1(h_\lambda)(x)} \mu_{0,\delta}^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})} \tag{6.4}$$

where $\Delta_y(\tilde{h}_\lambda)(x) = 2\tilde{h}_\lambda(x) - \tilde{h}_\lambda(x-y) - \tilde{h}_\lambda(x+y)$. (If $y=1$ we will often suppress it from the notation, and simply write Δ).

Equivalently, using the notations we introduced above, we can express this result as:

$$\mathrm{mult}_{(\delta_-,\delta)}^{(0,\lambda)} = \mathrm{mult}_{(0,\delta)}^{(0,\lambda)} + \Delta_{\delta_-}(\tilde{h}_\lambda)(x). \tag{6.5}$$

Recall the algebra of functions defined on $\mathbf{Q}$ with finite support (multiplication is given by the Cauchy convolution $m_1 * m_2(z) = \sum_{x+y=z} m_1(x)m_2(y)$). This is a commutative, unital associative algebra. We use the Dirac delta δ_x to denote the basis element corresponding to $x \in \mathbf{Q}$, so that δ_0 is the identity of convolution. If $T_x m$ is the left translation of m, i.e. $(T_x m)(y) = m(y-x)$, then $T_x m = \delta_x * m$. We have the obvious rules $\Delta(m_1 * m_2) = \Delta(m_1) * m_2 = m_1 * \Delta(m_2)$, also $\Delta(m) = \Delta(\delta_0) * m$.

In order to compute the residues $\mu_{1,\delta}^{n,(\{\mathtt{r}\})}$ for the collection of residue points $\mathtt{r}$ of Corollary 5.14, it suffices to list the functions $\tilde{h}_\lambda$ and $\Delta(\tilde{h}_\lambda)$ for these cases. In addition we will compute $\mathrm{mult}_{(0,\delta)}^{(0,\lambda)}$ in terms of $\tilde{h}_\lambda$.

Proposition 6.3. *Using the notations of Corollary 5.14, we have*

(a) *Let* $m \in (\mathbf{Z} \pm 1/4)_+$*, written as usual as* $m = \kappa + (2\epsilon - 1)/4$*. Let* $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ *be the parity of* κ*. Put* $p = 2(\kappa - 1) + \epsilon$*, the largest jump in the jump sequence of* λ*. Thus* $\lambda = \lambda_p$ *and* δ *are both determined by* p*, and for* $k \in \mathbf{Z}$ *we have:*

$$\tilde{h}_\lambda(k) = \begin{cases} 2\lfloor (p+2)/4 \rfloor & \textit{if } k = 0, \\ \max\{0, \lfloor (p + 2 - |k|)/2 \rfloor\} & \textit{else.} \end{cases}$$

We have $\operatorname{mult}_{(0,\delta)}^{(0,\lambda)} = -\tilde{h}_\lambda$*, and*

$$\Delta(\tilde{h}_\lambda) + \Delta_\delta(\delta_0) = -S_{p+1} + \delta_0,$$

where

$$S_{p+1}(k) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{p+1-k} & \textit{if } |k| \leq p + 1, \\ 0 & \textit{else.} \end{cases}$$

(b),(c) *The cases (b)* $(\delta = 0)$ *and (c)* $(\delta = 1)$ *can be treated uniformly. Let* $p = 2r + 1 + \delta$*, thus* $\lambda = \lambda_p$ *and* δ *are both determined by* p*, and for* $k \in \mathbf{Z}$ *we have:*

$$\tilde{h}_\lambda(k) = \begin{cases} 2\lfloor (p + 1 - \delta)/2 \rfloor = p + 1 - \delta & \textit{if } k = 0, \\ \max\{0, p + 1 - |k|\} & \textit{else.} \end{cases}$$

We have $\operatorname{mult}_{(0,\delta)}^{(0,\lambda)} = -2\tilde{h}_\lambda$*, and*

$$\Delta(\tilde{h}_\lambda) + \Delta_\delta(\delta_0) = \Delta_{(p+1)}(\delta_0) = -\delta_{(p+1)} - \delta_{-(p+1)} + 2\delta_0.$$

(d) *In this case* $\delta = 1$ *and* $p = 2a + 1$*, with* $a = 2(r + 1)$ *a power of* 2*. Hence* $\lambda = \lambda_p$ *is determined by* p*, and for* $k \in \mathbf{Z}$ *we have:*

$$\tilde{h}_\lambda(k) = \begin{cases} p - 1 & \textit{if } k = 0, \\ \max\{0, p + 1 - |k|\} & \textit{else.} \end{cases}$$

We have $\operatorname{mult}_{(0,\delta)}^{(0,\lambda)} = -2\tilde{h}_\lambda + \delta_1 + \delta_2 + \delta_4 + \cdots + \delta_a$*, and*

$$\Delta(\tilde{h}_\lambda) + \Delta_\delta(\delta_0) = -\delta_{(p+1)} - \delta_{-(p+1)} + \delta_{-1} + \delta_{+1}.$$

(e) *In this case* $\delta = 0$ *and* $p = 2a$*, with* $a = 2(r + 1)$ *a power of* 2*. Hence* $\lambda = \lambda_p$ *is determined by* p*, and for* $k \in \mathbf{Z}$ *we have:*

$$\tilde{h}_\lambda(k) = \begin{cases} p & \textit{if } k = 0, \\ \max\{0, p - |k|\} & \textit{if } 0 < |k| < p, \\ 1 & \textit{if } |k| = p, \\ 0 & \textit{else.} \end{cases}$$

We have $\operatorname{mult}_{(0,\delta)}^{(0,\lambda)} = -2\tilde{h}_\lambda + \delta_1 + \delta_2 + \delta_4 + \cdots + \delta_p$*, and*

$$\Delta(\tilde{h}_\lambda) = (-\delta_{(p+1)} + \delta_p - \delta_{(p-1)}) + (-\delta_{-(p-1)} + \delta_{-p} - \delta_{-(p+1)}) + 2\delta_0.$$

Proof. We use the rules (cf. [OS, Proposition 6.6]) describing a linear residual point ξ for B_n with parameter $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ and $k = \log(q)$, in terms of a distinguished δ-partition λ. The number m_0 of coordinates equal to 0 is equal to $\lfloor (m_1 + 1 - \delta)/2 \rfloor$, where m_1 is the number of coordinates equal to $\pm k$. In terms of $\tilde{h}_\lambda$, this means that $\tilde{h}_\lambda(0) = \lfloor (\tilde{h}_\lambda(1) + 1 - \delta)/2 \rfloor$. For positive integers n, $\tilde{h}_\lambda(n)$ equals the number of *jumps* in the jump sequence $\jmath = (\lambda - \mathbf{1})/2$ which are larger than or equal to n. Since we extended the function $\tilde{h}_\lambda$ as an even function, this shows that $\tilde{h}_\lambda$ is determined by (δ, λ) and can be read of simply from the information provided in Corollary 5.14. ☐

6.3. **Residues at arbitrary residual points.** We continue to assume that

$$\mathtt{r} = (-\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},\delta_-;\lambda_-)}, \mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},\delta_+;\lambda_+)})$$

is a residual point for $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min}$ such that the residue $(\mu^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})^{(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_q$ has no odd cyclotomic factors.

By the combined results of Lemma 5.4 (for $\delta_\pm = 1/2$), Corollary 5.14 (for $\delta_\pm \in \{0,1\}$) and Proposition 6.3, the degree $(\mu^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})^{(\{\mathtt{r}\})}_q$, or equivalently the multiplicity function $\mathrm{mult}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}_{(\mathfrak{b};\delta_-,\delta_+)}$ is determined if one of λ_- or λ_+ is the zero partition. In general we need to also take into account the "mixed" factors of this residue, which arise from the type D-roots which are a product of a coordinate (or its reciprocal) of $-\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},\delta_-;\lambda_-)}$ and a coordinate (or its reciprocal) of $\mathtt{r}_{(\mathfrak{b},\delta_+;\lambda_+)}$). Since each nonzero factor of (2.4) obviously either comes from such "mixed" root or not, it follows that:

Proposition 6.4. *Suppose that* $\mathfrak{b} \in \{1,2\}$. *For all* $k \in (\mathbf{Z}/\mathfrak{b})_+$ *we have:*

$$\mathrm{mult}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}_{(\mathfrak{b};\delta_-,\delta_+)}(\mathfrak{b}k) = \Delta(\tilde{h}_{\lambda_-} * \tilde{h}_{\lambda_+})(k) + \mathrm{mult}^{(0,\lambda_+)}_{(\mathfrak{b};\delta_-,\delta_+)}(\mathfrak{b}k) + \mathrm{mult}^{(0,\lambda_-)}_{(\mathfrak{b};\delta_+,\delta_-)}(\mathfrak{b}k)$$

It is also easy to see that we always have:

$$\mathrm{mult}^{(0,\lambda_\pm)}_{(\mathfrak{b};\delta_\mp,\delta_\pm)}(\mathfrak{b}k) = (\Delta_{\delta_\mp}(\delta_0) * \tilde{h}_{\lambda_\pm})(k) + \mathrm{mult}^{(0,\lambda_\pm)}_{(\mathfrak{b};0,\delta_\pm)}(\mathfrak{b}k)$$

Combined with the results of Remark 5.6, Corollary 5.14 and Proposition 6.3 this formula enables us to express $\mathrm{mult}^{(0,\lambda_\pm)}_{(\mathfrak{b};\delta_\mp,\delta_\pm)}(\mathfrak{b}k)$ *in terms of* $\tilde{h}_{\lambda_+}$ *and* $\tilde{h}_{\lambda_-}$.

We now have enough tools to prove case by case that the solutions of (6.2) indeed constitute an $\mathrm{Aut}_{es}(\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min})$-orbit of images of standard STMs.

6.4. **Proof of the main Theorem for odd orthogonal groups.** We consider $G_{\mathrm{qs}} = \mathbf{SO}_{2n+1}$. This is of parameter type II, and this is by far the simplest case.

6.4.1. *Proof of Theorem 1.6(a), (b).* The right hand side of (6.2) is of the form $\mathrm{fdeg}_q(\sigma) = d^{\mathrm{D}}_a(q)d^{\mathrm{B}}_b(q)$ (see (3.2)), and a glance at the tables in [Car, 13.7] readily shows that the multiplicity functions $m^e_{a,b}$ for $d_{a,b} := d^{\mathrm{D}}_a(q)d^{\mathrm{B}}_b(q)$ is of the form (where $k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$):

$$m^e_{a,b}(k) = -(\max\{0, 2a-k\} + \max\{0, 2b+1-k\}) \tag{6.6}$$

On the other hand, we have $\delta_\pm = 1/2$ in this case, and $\mathfrak{b} = 1$. Lemma 5.4 implies that $\lambda_\pm = [2, 4, \ldots, 2r_\pm]$, and that the corresponding multiplicity functions $\tilde{h}_\pm$ are supported on $\mathbf{Z}+1/2$ and are given by $h_\pm(x) = \max\{0, p_\pm + 1 - |x|\}$ where $p_\pm = r_\pm - 1/2 = m_\pm - 1$. We **warn** the reader that from here onwards we are using the notation $\lambda_\pm$, $m_\pm$, $p_\pm$ etc. in the sense of Subsections 5.1 and 5.2, but *not* as in the Subsection 5.4. Applying

Proposition 6.3, Lemma 5.4, and Remark 5.6 we have (with $\tilde{h}_\pm := \tilde{h}_{\lambda_\pm}$ and $k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{mult}_{(1/2,1/2)}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}(k)\\
=&\Delta(\tilde{h}_- * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - \tilde{h}_-(k-1/2) - \tilde{h}_-(k+1/2) - \tilde{h}_+(k-1/2) - \tilde{h}_+(k+1/2)\\
=&(\Delta(\tilde{h}_-) * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - \tilde{h}_-(k-1/2) - \tilde{h}_-(k+1/2) - \tilde{h}_+(k-1/2) - \tilde{h}_+(k+1/2)\\
=&-T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+ - T_{+(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+ - \tilde{h}_-(k-1/2) - \tilde{h}_-(k+1/2)\\
=&-(\max\{0, p_- + p_+ + 2 - k\} + \max\{0, |p_+ - p_-| - k\})
\end{aligned}$$

so that necessarily $\{2a, 2b+1\} = \{p_+ + p_- + 2, |p_+ - p_-|\} = \{m_- + m_+, |m_+ - m_-|\}$, as was to be proved (compare with (3.3), and using the standard STM $\phi_{(d,+),T}^{(m_-,m_+)} : T_d \to T_{d+m_+-1/2}$ of [Op3, 3.2.5]).

It is instructive to carefully analyze the last step in the above computation. If k is sufficiently large then $m_{a,b}^e(k)$ and $\mathrm{mult}_{(1/2,1/2)}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}(k)$ are zero. Decreasing k to 1 we meet three interesting arguments of $\mathrm{mult}_{(1/2,1/2)}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}$, namely $k_1 = p_- + p_+ + 1$ (this is the first argument where $\mathrm{mult}_{(1/2,1/2)}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}(k)$ is nonzero), $k_2 = p_- + 1/2$ (this is the first argument after $T_{p_-+1}\tilde{h}_+(k)$ reached its maximum) and $k_3 = |p_+ - p_-| - 1$ (this is the argument where either $T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+$ starts to increase (if $p_- < p_+$) or where $T_{(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+$ stops to decrease (if $p_- > p_+$). Now compare to $m_{a,b}^e(k)$. We see that $k_1 = \max\{2a-1, 2b\}$. At k_2, we see that $-\tilde{h}_-(k-1/2) - \tilde{h}_-(k+1/2)$ exactly repairs the linear behavior of $T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k)$ at $k_2 < k \leq k_1$. Finally, for $k \leq k_3$ we obtain (in either case) an additional linear contribution, implying that $k_3 = \min(2a-1, 2b)$.

Observe that $\mathtt{r}_{\lambda_-,\lambda_+}$ represents an STM ϕ which is a composition of the standard translation STMs described in [Op3, 3.2.5] (also see [Fe1, Fe2]):

$$\phi = \phi_{1/2,3/2}^{(m_--1/2)(m_-+1/2)/2+(m_+-1/2)(m_++1/2)/2-1,+} \circ \cdots \circ \phi_{m_--1,m_+}^{m_--1/2,-} \circ \phi_{m_-,m_+}^{0,-} \tag{6.7}$$

6.4.2. *Proof of Theorem 1.6(c), (d).* We start by making some general observations on the isotropy groups of orbits of discrete unipotent (i.e. unramified) local Langlands parameters $[\lambda_{ad}]$ under the action of $(\Omega_{ad}^\theta)^*$. These remarks will be a basis of our analysis for all cases below.

First of all, via [Bo, Section 6] (see also the Introduction of the present paper) it follows that the set of such $[\lambda_{ad}]$ are in canonical bijection with the set of central characters of $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}})$ which support discrete series characters of $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}})$ (where G_{qs} is quasi-split, and of adjoint type). Since this is important for understanding the isotropy groups, let us discuss this in some detail.

The set of central characters of $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}})$ supporting discrete series representations was described in [OS, Section 8], which we will now recall (also see the Introduction). The lattice Y_{qs} is the projection of $X^*(S)$ onto the vector space V^θ of θ-invariants (notations as in the Introduction), and this is the coroot lattice $Q_{\mathrm{qs}}^\vee$ when G_{qs} is of adjoint type. Hence, the subgroup $\Gamma = Y_{\mathrm{qs}}/Q_{\mathrm{qs}}^\vee \subset \Gamma_{spec}$ (see [OS, Section 8]) of the full group Γ_{spec}

of *special* diagram automorphisms $\Gamma_{spec} := P^\vee_{\mathrm{qs}}/Q^\vee_{\mathrm{qs}}$ of the spectral diagram is trivial: $\Gamma = \Gamma_{ad} = 1$ in our present situation. In general we have a natural short exact sequence

$$1 \to \Gamma \to \Gamma_{spec} \to (\Omega^\theta)^* \to 1,$$

and in the present situation this implies that $(\Omega^\theta_{ad})^* = \Gamma_{spec}$ is the full group of diagram automorphisms of the spectral diagram of $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}})$.

Observe that the *spectral diagram* (cf. [Op2, Op3]) of $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}})$ is easily seen to be the untwisted version of the Kac diagram $\mathrm{K}(\theta G^\vee)$ (see [R3]) of the based root datum $\Sigma^\vee$ with respect to the diagram automorphism θ, whose vertices v are labelled with parameters $m_v \mathfrak{b} \log(\mathbf{q})$ such that the group of spectral diagram automorphisms and the group of Kac diagram automorphisms can be identified (the multiples m_v reflect the twisting information).

In [OS, Section 8] it was also explained that the set of central characters of $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}})$ which support a discrete series representation, is in bijection with the set of pairs $(\Gamma s(e), W_{s(e)}\xi)$ of a Γ-orbit of vertices e of the spectral diagram (i.e. a node e of $\mathrm{K}(\theta G^\vee)$ in our present situation) and an orbit of linear residual points $W_{s(e)}\xi$ of the graded affine Hecke algebra $\mathbf{H}_e$ associated to Γe. The latter orbits $W_{s(e)}\xi$ are in canonical bijection with the set of distinguished nilpotent orbits $N \subset \mathfrak{g}^{\theta.s(e)}$ of the Lie algebra of fixed points $\mathfrak{g}^{\theta.s(e)}$ corresponding to the torsion element $s(e) \in T^\theta$ associated with the node e.

Furthermore, λ_{ad} is completely determined by a semisimple conjugacy class in ${}^LG$ of the image $\theta.s = \lambda_{ad}(\mathrm{Frob})$ of the Frobenius, and a distinguished nilpotent orbit ξ_s in the Lie algebra of the centralizer $C_{{}^LG}(\theta.s)$. We know that we can choose the semisimple element s in the fundamental dual alcove $C^\vee$ (see [R3, Theorem 3.7]). We need in addition that the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}^{\theta.s}$ admits distinguished nilpotent orbits, i.e. $\mathfrak{g}^{\theta.s}$ is semisimple. This forces $s = s(e)$ to be a vertex of $C^\vee$. Hence the set of conjugacy classes of discrete unipotent local Langlands parameters $\lambda_{ad}(\mathrm{Frob})$ is therefore also in natural bijection with the set of pairs (e, N), where e is a vertex of the Kac diagram (see [R3, Section 3.3, 3.4]) and N a distinguished nilpotent orbit of $\mathfrak{g}^{\theta.s(e)}$.

This setup shows that this set of central characters of unipotent affine Hecke algebras, is in natural bijection with the set of discrete unipotent Langlands parameters λ_{ad}.

An element $\beta \in (\Omega^\theta_{ad})^* = \Gamma_{spec}$ fixes $[\lambda_{ad}]$ if and only if β fixes $s(e)$, and in addition the action of β on $\mathfrak{g}^{\theta.s(e)}$ should fix N (or equivalently $W_{s(e)}\xi$). An important remark is that linear residual orbits $W_{s(e)}\xi$ of a graded affine Hecke algebra $\mathbf{H}$ associated to an irreducible based root system $R \supset F$ will be invariant for all diagram automorphisms of $R \supset F$ (see [Op1, Theorem 7.14(i)]). Moreover, if the orbit of residual points $W_0\mathfrak{r}$ which corresponds to $(e, W_{s(e)}\xi)$ as above, represents a standard STM, then it is obvious (from the definitions of the standard STMs in Section 3) that if $R_{s(e)} = \{\alpha \in R : \alpha(s) = 1\}$ contains isomorphic irreducible components then the components of $W_{s(e)}\xi$ attached to these components correspond to each other under a (hence any) isomorphism between these components. In short, the isotropy group $\Gamma_{spec,W_0\mathfrak{r}}$ is simply equal to the isotropy group $\Gamma_{spec,e} = (\Omega^\theta_{ad})^*_e$ of the vertex e of $\mathrm{K}(\theta G^\vee)$.

On the arithmetic side we see similar phenomena (see the Introduction), since a cuspidal unipotent pair $(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma)$ is known to be inert for twisting by automorphisms of $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ defined over $\mathbf{F_q}$. This implies that the isotropy subgroup of $(u,\mathbb{P},\sigma)$ in Ω_{ad}^{θ} is simply is the stabilizer subgroup $\Omega_{ad}^{\mathbb{P},\theta}$ of $\mathbb{P}$.

Let us now return to the case at hand: the case of odd orthogonal groups. We established that the equation (6.2) with $\mathrm{fdeg}_q(\sigma)=d_a^{\mathrm{D}}(q)d_b^{\mathrm{B}}(q)$ forces $\mathtt{r}=(-\mathtt{r}_-,\mathtt{r}_+)=(-\mathtt{r}_{(1/2;\lambda_-)},\mathtt{r}_{(1/2;\lambda_+)})$, where $\lambda_\pm$ are the residual points as described in Corollary 5.5, with parameters $m_\pm$ which are related to a,b by the equation of sets $\{2a,2b+1\}=\{m_-+m_+,|m_+-m_-|\}$. In this case $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}})\rightsquigarrow\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{X}}_{min}$ is in fact an isomorphism (see [Op3, 3.2.6]), and we may associate a unique unramified discrete Langlands parameter $[\lambda_{ad}]$ to the pair (λ_-,λ_+) via the correspondence discussed in Remark 1.10 and above.

Recall that the spectral map diagram of the STM $\mathcal{H}^0_{m_-,m_+}\rightsquigarrow\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}})$ defines a maximal proper subdiagram of the spectral diagram of the latter Hecke algebra, which has two (possibly empty) components of type $\mathrm{C}_{n_\pm}$ with $n_\pm=(1/2)(m_\pm+1/2)(m_\pm-1/2)$. On the other hand, the parahoric subgroup $\mathbb{P}_{a,b}$ associated to a pair a,b is defined by a maximal proper subdiagram of its arithmetic diagram, which consists of two (possibly empty) components of type D_{a^2} and of type B_{b^2+b}.

One observes that the isotropy group of $[\lambda_{ad}]$ in $(\Omega_{ad}^{\theta})^*\simeq C_2$ is trivial except when $m_-=m_+$. This happens if and only if $a=0$, and this happens if and only if $\Omega_{ad}^{\mathbb{P},\theta}$ is trivial, as desired.

6.5. **Proof of the main Theorem for unitary groups.** In this subsection we consider the case $G_{\mathrm{qs}}=\mathbf{PU}_{2n}$ or $G_{\mathrm{qs}}=\mathbf{PU}_{2n+1}$, which are the cases in type I. In the first case (the odd rank case) we have a spectral covering map $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}})=\mathrm{B}_n(2,1)[q]\rightsquigarrow\mathrm{C}_n(\frac{1}{2},0)[q^2]$ (a double cover), and in the second case (the even rank case) we have a (spectral) isomorphism $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}})\rightsquigarrow\mathrm{C}_n(\frac{1}{2},1)[q^2]$.

6.5.1. *Proof of Theorem 1.6(a), (b).* This is type I. The right hand side of (6.2) is of the form $\mathrm{fdeg}_q(\sigma)=d_s^{\{^2\mathrm{A}\}}(q)d_t^{\{^2\mathrm{A}\}}(q):=d_{s,t}$ (see (3.2)), and a glance at the tables in [Car, §13.7] readily shows that the multiplicity function $m^e_{s,t}$ for $d_{s,t}$ is supported on the odd integers, and is of the form (where $k\in(\mathbf{Z}+1/2)_+$):

$$m^e_{s,t}(2k)=-(\max\{0,s+1/2-k\}+\max\{0,t+1/2-k\})\tag{6.8}$$

On the other hand, we have $\delta_-=1/2$ and $\delta_+\in\{0,1\}$ in this case, and $\mathfrak{b}=2$, so Lemma 5.4 implies that $\lambda_-=[2,4,\dots,2r_-]$, and λ_+ is as described in Proposition 6.3. The corresponding multiplicity function $\tilde{h}_-$ is supported on $\mathbf{Z}+1/2$, and $\tilde{h}_+$ is supported on $\mathbf{Z}$. We know we can write $h_-(x)=\max\{0,p_-+1-|x|\}$ where $p_-=m_--1$ and $m_+=r_-+1/2$, but at this point there are still various choices for $h_+=h_{\lambda_+}$ possible. Applying Proposition 6.3, Lemma 5.4, and Remark 5.6 we have (with $\tilde{h}_\pm:=\tilde{h}_{\lambda_\pm}$ and

$k \in (\mathbf{Z}/2)_+$):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{mult}_{2;(1/2,\delta)}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}(2k)\\
=&\Delta(\tilde{h}_- * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) + \mathrm{mult}_{2;(1/2,\delta_+)}^{(0,\lambda_+)}(2k)\\
=&((\Delta(\tilde{h}_-) + \Delta_{1/2}(\delta_0)) * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) + \mathrm{mult}_{2;(0,\delta_+)}^{(0,\lambda_+)}(2k)\\
=&-T_{(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) + 2\tilde{h}_+(k) + \mathrm{mult}_{(0,\delta_+)}^{(0,\lambda_+)}(k).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that $m_{s,t}^e(2k)$ is nonzero only if $k \in \mathbf{Z} + 1/2$. This implies that for all $k \in \mathbf{Z}$ we must have $2\tilde{h}_+(k) + \mathrm{mult}_{(0,\delta_+)}^{(0,\lambda_+)}(k) = 0$, since all other terms in the expression are obviously equal to zero for $k \in \mathbf{Z}$. Checking the cases in Proposition 6.3 we see that this happens if and only if λ_+ is of the form described in cases (b) or (c). Hence we have $\lambda_+ = [1, 3, \ldots, 1 + 2p_+]$ with $p_+ = m_+ - 1$ and $m_+ = 2r_+ + 2 + \delta_+$, and

$$\mathrm{mult}_{2;(1/2,\delta)}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}(2k) = -T_{(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k)$$

From here on the argument is completely analogous to the odd orthogonal case Subsection 6.4. We see that necessarily $\{s - 1/2, t - 1/2\} = \{p_+ + p_- + 1, |p_+ - p_-| - 1\}$ or $\{s + 1/2, t + 1/2\} = \{m_- + m_+, |m_+ - m_-|\}$, as was to be proved (compare with (3.3), and with Subsection 5.2).

6.5.2. *Proof of Theorem 1.6(c), (d).* In this case $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}_{min}^{\mathcal{X}}$ is in fact an isomorphism if the rank is even and it is a double cover if the rank is odd (see [Op3, 3.2.6]). The group $\Gamma_{spec} = (\Omega_{ad}^\theta)^*$ is trivial in the first case, and equal to C_2 in the second.

As discussed above, we may associate a unique unramified discrete local Langlands parameter $[\lambda_{ad}]$ to the pair (λ_-, λ_+), via the correspondence discussed in Remark 1.10 and above in Subsection 6.4. Recall that we have $\{s+1/2, t+1/2\} = \{m_+ + m_-, |m_+ - m_-|\}$ with $m_- \in (\mathbf{Z}+1/2)_+$ and $m_+ \in \mathbf{Z}_+$, where $\mathbb{P}_{s,t}$ corresponds to a maximal proper θ-stable subdiagram of the affine Dynkin diagram of G_{qs} with two (possibly empty) components, of type ${}^2\mathrm{A}_{(s/2)(s+1)-1}$ and ${}^2\mathrm{A}_{(t/2)(t+1)-1}$, while the spectral map diagram of the STM $\mathcal{H}_{m_-,m_+}^0 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}})$ defines a maximal proper subdiagram of the spectral diagram of $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}})$ (the complement of a vertex e of the spectral diagram), which has two (possibly empty) components, one of type $\mathrm{D}_{m_+^2/2}$ (odd rank case) or $\mathrm{C}_{(m_+-1)(m_++1)/2}$ (even rank case), and one of type $\mathrm{B}_{(m_--1/2)(m_-+1/2)/2}$.

Regarding isotropy subgroups of $\Omega^{\mathbb{P}_{s,t},\theta}$ and $(\Omega^\theta)_{W_0\mathtt{r}}^* = \Gamma_{spec,e}$ we see that in the even rank case there is nothing to prove, while in the odd rank case the former group is trivial unless $s = t$, in which case it equals $\Omega^\theta = C_2$. At the other side, $(\Omega^\theta)_{W_0\mathtt{r}}^*$ is C_2, unless $m_+ = 0$, which happens if and only if $s = t$, as was to be proven.

6.6. **Proof of the main Theorem for symplectic and even orthogonal groups.** In this subsection we treat the cases with G_{qs} of type $\mathbf{PCSp}_{2n}$, $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{CO}_{2n}^0)$ or $\mathbf{P}((\mathbf{CO}_{2n+2}^*)^0)$, which are of type III (first case) or of type IV (the last two cases). We have spectral covering maps $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}}) \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{C}_n(\delta_-, \delta_+)[q]$ with $(\delta_-, \delta_+) = (0,0)$, $(0,1)$, $(1,0)$ or $(1,1)$ respectively, represented by a covering map of algebraic tori of degree 2 in the first three cases (cf. [Op2, 3.3.5]) (of course, the cases two and three are isomorphic, but it is convenient to allow both possibilities at this point), and which is an isomorphism in the last case.

Before we embark on the proof, let us recall the smallest unipotent partitions λ which belong of the cases (a)–(e) of Corollary 5.14 and Proposition 6.3. We always denote by p the largest element of the support of the function $\tilde{h}_\lambda$, and we formally extend this to cases where λ is the zero partition (compatible with our formulas for residues). If $\lambda = 0$ then we put $p = -1$ if $\delta = 0$ and $p = 0$ if $\delta = 1$. These can be viewed as a case (a), or as case (b) (if $\delta = 0$) or as case (c) (if $\delta = 1$). If $p = 1$ then $\lambda = [3]$, and this is a case (a) cuspidal partition, or $\lambda = [1, 3]$, which is case (b). If $p = 2$ then $\lambda = [1, 5]$, which is a case (a), or $\lambda = [1, 3, 5]$, which is case (c). The smallest case (d) is $[3, 5, 7]$ (with $p = 3$), and the smallest case (e) is $[1, 3, 5, 9]$ (with $p = 4$).

6.6.1. *Proof of Theorem 1.6(a), (b).* The right hand side of (6.2) is of the form

$$\mathrm{fdeg}_q(\sigma) = d_a^{\mathrm{B}}(q)d_b^{\mathrm{B}}(q) \text{ or } \mathrm{fdeg}_q(\sigma) = d_a^{\mathrm{B}}(q^2)d_b^{{}^2\mathrm{A}}(q)$$

in the first case, or of the form

$$\mathrm{fdeg}_q(\sigma) = d_a^{\mathrm{D}}(q)d_b^{\mathrm{D}}(q) \text{ or } \mathrm{fdeg}_q(\sigma) = d_b^{\mathrm{D}}(q)d_a^{{}^2\mathrm{A}}(q)$$

in the last two cases (see (3.2)). A glance at the tables in [Car, 13.7] readily shows that the multiplicity function $m_{a,b}^{e,ord,\mathrm{III}}$ for $d_{a,b}^{ord,\mathrm{III}} := d_a^{\mathrm{B}}(q)d_b^{\mathrm{B}}(q)$ is of the form (where $k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$):

$$m_{a,b}^{e,ord,\mathrm{III}}(k) = -(\max\{0, 2a+1-k\} + \max\{0, 2b+1-k\}) \tag{6.9}$$

while $m_{a,b}^{e,extra,\mathrm{III}}$ for $d_{a,b}^{extra,\mathrm{III}} := d_a^{\mathrm{B}}(q^2)d_b^{{}^2\mathrm{A}}(q)$ is of the form

$$m_{a,b}^{extra,\mathrm{III}}(k) = -(\max_{int}\{0, (4a+2-k)/2\} + \max_{int}\{0, (2b+1-k)/2\}) \tag{6.10}$$

where $\max_{int}$ is **defined** as the largest *integer* of a finite set of rational numbers, or 0 if the set contains no integer.

Similarly, for the parameter type IV, the multiplicity function $m_{a,b}^{e,ord,\mathrm{IV}}$ for $d_{a,b}^{ord,\mathrm{IV}} := d_a^{\mathrm{D}}(q)d_b^{\mathrm{D}}(q)$ is of the form (where $k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$):

$$m_{a,b}^{e,ord,\mathrm{IV}}(k) = -(\max\{0, 2a-k\} + \max\{0, 2b-k\}) \tag{6.11}$$

while $m_{a,b}^{e,extra,\mathrm{IV}}$ for $d_{a,b}^{extra,\mathrm{IV}} := d_a^{\mathrm{D}}(q^2)d_b^{{}^2\mathrm{A}}(q)$ is of the form

$$m_{a,b}^{extra,\mathrm{IV}}(k) = -(\max_{int}\{0, (4a-k)/2\} + \max_{int}\{0, (2b+1-k)/2\}) \tag{6.12}$$

If $\mathbf{r} = (-\mathbf{r}_{\lambda_-}, \mathbf{r}_{\lambda_+})$ is a solution of (6.2) then $\lambda_\pm$ must both belong to the cases listed in Corollary 5.14, with $\delta_\pm$ determined by G_{qs}. Using Proposition 6.3 and Proposition 6.4 we will compute the multiplicity function $\mathrm{mult}_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}(k)$ where $\lambda_\pm$ belongs to one of these cases (a)-(e) as listed in Corollary 5.14, to study whether such combinations could provide solutions of equation (6.2).

Let us first assume that $\lambda_\pm$ both belong to case (b) (if $\delta_\pm = 0$) or to case (c) (if $\delta_\pm = 1$). Note that it is strictly speaking not necessary to treat these cases, since we already know that they all represent standard STMs. Yet it is useful and instructive to do the calculations.

Recall that if $(\delta_-, \delta_+) = (1,1)$ then the normalization factor $d^0_{1,1}$ of the μ-function of $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}})$ is $d^D_1 = (1+q)^{-1}$ (due to the fact that in this case, a maximal K split torus of G_{qs} which is defined over k and maximal k-split has a k-anisotropic factor of dimension 1 which splits over an unramified quadratic extension of k; this gives rise to the even cyclotomic factor $(1+q)$ in the volume of Iwahori subgroup). In all other cases $d^0_{1,1} = 1$. In order to take this extra factor into account we need to subtract $\delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)$ from the multiplicity function $\mathrm{mult}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}(k)$ (see definition 6.1). Thus we have, using Proposition 6.3, and analogous to the odd orthogonal cases, for all $k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{mult}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&\Delta(\tilde{h}_- * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_+(k) + \Delta_{\delta_-}(\tilde{h}_+)(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&\Delta(\tilde{h}_- * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_+(k) + (\Delta_{\delta_-}(\delta_0) * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&\big((\Delta(\tilde{h}_-) + \Delta_{\delta_-}(\delta_0)) * \tilde{h}_+\big)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_+(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&-T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - T_{+(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) - \delta_+\delta_{(p_-+1)}(k) + \delta_+\delta_-\delta_1(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&-T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - T_{+(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) - \delta_+\delta_{(p_-+1)}(k)\\
=&-(\max\{0, p_- + p_+ + 2 - k\} + \max\{0, |p_+ - p_-| - k\})
\end{aligned}$$

so that this could be a solution of (6.2), but clearly only if the right hand side is of the form $m^{e,ord,\mathrm{III}}_{a,b}(k)$ (if the parities of p_- and p_+ are distinct) or of the form $m^{e,ord,\mathrm{IV}}_{a,b}(k)$ (if the parities of p_- and p_+ are equal). In the first case we see that $\mathtt{r}$ is a solution of (6.2) if and only if $\{2a+1, 2b+1\} = \{p_++p_-+2, |p_+-p_-|\} = \{m_-+m_+, |m_+-m_-|\}$, and in the second case if and only if $\{2a, 2b\} = \{p_+ + p_- + 2, |p_+ - p_-|\} = \{m_- + m_+, |m_+ - m_-|\}$. These solutions correspond exactly to the ordinary standard translation STMs (compare with (3.3), and with Subsection 5.2).

The second case we will consider is that of the cuspidal extra special STMs, that is, when both $\lambda_\pm$ belong to case (a). (Again, strictly speaking this is not necessary, since all cases are known to represent cuspidal extra special STMs.) We compute, using Proposition 6.3 and Proposition 6.4, for $k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{mult}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&\Delta(\tilde{h}_- * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - \tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - \tilde{h}_+(k) + \Delta_{\delta_-}(\tilde{h}_+)(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&(\Delta(\tilde{h}_-) * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - \tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - \tilde{h}_+(k) + (\Delta_{\delta_-}(\delta_0) * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&-(S_{p_-+1} * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - \tilde{h}_-(k) + \delta_+(-S_{p_-+1} - \Delta_{\delta_-}(\delta_0) + \delta_0)(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&-(S_{p_-+1} * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - \tilde{h}_-(k) + \delta_+(-S_{p_-+1} + \delta_-\delta_1)(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&-(S_{p_-+1} * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - \tilde{h}_-(k) - \delta_+S_{p_-+1}(k)
\end{aligned}$$

Now observe that there exists a unique symmetric function $\tilde{H}_+$ supported on $\mathbf{Z}+1/2$ and a remainder R_{m_+} such that we have $\tilde{h}_+ = (\delta_{-1/2}+\delta_{+1/2}) * \tilde{H}_+ + R_{m_+}\delta_0$. One checks easily that in fact $R_{m_+} = (-1)^{\epsilon_+}2(\lfloor\frac{p_++2}{4}\rfloor + \epsilon_+\delta_+)$ and $\tilde{H}_+(k) = \max_{int}\{0, (2p_+ - 2|k| + 3)/4\}$.

We may continue the computation as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{mult}_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&-(S_{p_-+1} * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - \tilde{h}_-(k) - \delta_+ S_{p_-+1}(k)\\
=&-S_{p_-+1} * (\delta_{-1/2} + \delta_{+1/2}) * \tilde{H}_+(k) - R_{m_+} S_{p_-+1}(k) - \tilde{h}_-(k) - \delta_+ S_{p_-+1}(k)\\
=&-T_{p_-+3/2}\tilde{H}_+(k) - T_{-(p_-+3/2)}\tilde{H}_+(k) - (R_{m_+} + \delta_+)S_{p_-+1}(k) - \tilde{h}_-(k)\\
=&-T_{p_-+3/2}\tilde{H}_+(k) - T_{-(p_-+3/2)}\tilde{H}_+(k) - (-1)^{\epsilon_+}2(\lfloor \frac{p_+ + 2}{4} \rfloor + \delta_+)S_{p_-+1}(k) - \tilde{h}_-(k)\\
=&\max_{int}\{0, (p_- + p_+ + 3 - k)/2\} + \max_{int}\{0, (|p_- - p_+| - k)/2\}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from carefully checking what happens at $k = p_- + 2, p_- + 1, p_-, \ldots$ and at $|p_+ + p_-| - 1, |p_+ + p_-| - 2, \ldots$ at the various congruence classes of p_+ modulo 4. Now use that in case (a), we have $p_\pm = 2(\kappa_\pm - 1) + \epsilon = 2m_\pm - 3/2$. Hence we see that $\mathtt{r}$ is a solution of (6.2) if and only if the right hand side is of type $d_{a,b}^{extra,\mathrm{III}}$, in which case we need that $\{m_- + m_+, |m_- - m_+|\} = \{2a+1, b+1/2\}$, or of type $d_{a,b}^{extra,\mathrm{IV}}$, in which case we need $\{m_- + m_+, |m_- - m_+|\} = \{2a, b+1/2\}$. These are indeed the residual points representing the cuspidal extra special STMs.

Let us now try to find solutions of (6.2) with λ_- is of type (b) or (c), and λ_+ of type (a). We allow any pair $(\delta_-, \delta_+) \in \{0,1\}^2$ here. Similar to the previous computations, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{mult}_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&\Delta(\tilde{h}_- * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - \tilde{h}_+(k) + \Delta_{\delta_-}(\tilde{h}_+)(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&((\Delta(\tilde{h}_-) + \Delta_{\delta_-}(\delta_0)) * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - \tilde{h}_+(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&-T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - T_{p_-+1}\tilde{h}_+(k) + \tilde{h}_+(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&-T_{p_-+1}\tilde{h}_+(k) + \tilde{h}_+(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) - T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - \delta_+\delta_{p_-+1}(k)
\end{aligned}$$

If both $p_-, p_+ \geq 1$ then the above expression has value -1 at $k = p_- + p_+ + 1$ and value -1 at $k = p_- + p_+$, and from the form of the available cuspidal formal degrees we easily conclude that if $\mathtt{r}$ solves (6.2) in this case, then the right hand side has to be of the form $d_{a,b}^{extra,\mathrm{III}}$, or $d_{a,b}^{extra,\mathrm{IV}}$ where a and b are such that one of the corresponding extraspecial parameters (m_-^e, m_+^e) equals $1/4$. Indeed, if λ_-^e, λ_+^e are the unipotent partitions of type (a) such that the image of the corresponding extra special STM $\mathtt{r}_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}^{(\lambda_-^e,\lambda_+^e)}$ also solves of (6.2) (with the same right hand side), then the values of the two highest multiplicities we just discussed imply that $p_+^e + p_-^e + 1$, and $|p_+^e - p_-^e| - 2$ differ by one (see the formula for the multiplicties of the residue we derived in the case where λ_- and λ_+ are both type (a)), from which we conclude that one of $p_\pm^e$ equals -1, or equivalently $m_\pm^e = 1/4$. Let us say that $p_\pm^e = -1$, and **denote** $p_{max}^e = p_\mp^e$. Since $p_- + p_+ + 1 = p_-^e + p_+^e + 1$ we have $p_{max}^e = p_- + p_+ + 1$. On the other hand, looking at above formula, it is clear that for all $k > p_- + 1$, the term $\tilde{h}_+(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) - \delta_+\delta_{p_-+1}(k) - T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k)$ has to vanish, while at $k = p_- + 1$ this expression needs to be 0, -1, or -2 (depending on the congruence class of p_+ modulo 4), and at $k = p_-$ it always needs to be -1 (we invite the reader to draw the graph of T_{p_-+1} for $k = p_-$, $p_- + 1$, $p_- + 1$, $p_- + 2$ and compare this with the graph of $-h_{\lambda_+^e}$ to see this). It follows that $p_- + 1 = p_+$ or $p_- = p_+$.

In the first case we have $p^e_{max} = p_- + p_+ + 1 = 2p_+$. Now we compute the rank n in terms of (p_-, p_+) and of (p^e_-, p^e_+). The first method gives $n = n_- + n_+$ with

$$n_- = \begin{cases} m_-^2/2 = (p_- + 1)^2/2, & \text{type (b)} \\ (m_- - 1)(m_- + 1)/2 = p_-(p_- + 2)/2, & \text{type (c)} \end{cases}$$

Hence $n_- \leq p_+^2/2$. For n_+ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} n_+ &= \lfloor \kappa_+(2(\kappa_+ - 1) + 2\epsilon_+ - 1)/2 \rfloor = \lfloor (p_+ + 2 - \epsilon)(p_+ + 1 + \epsilon)/4 \rfloor \\ &= \lfloor (p_+ + 1)(p_+ + 2)/4 \rfloor \leq (p_+ + 1)(p_+ + 2)/4. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $n \leq p_+^2/2 + (p_+ + 1)(p_+ + 2)/4 = 3p_+(p_+ + 1)/4 + 1/2$. The second method gives $n = n^e_- + n^e_+ = n^e_+ = \lfloor (2p_+ + 1)(2p_+ + 2)/4 \rfloor \geq p_+(p_+ + 3/2)$. We conclude that $p_+(p_+ + 3/2) \leq 3p_+(p_+ + 1)/4 + 1/2$, which implies $p_+ \leq 1$, hence $p_- \leq 0$, a contradiction.

In the second case we have $p^e_{max} = 2p_+ + 1$. We now find that

$$\begin{aligned} n &\leq (p_+ + 1)^2/2 + (p_+ + 1)(p_+ + 2)/4 = (p_+ + 1)(3p_+ + 4)/4 \\ &= 3p_+(p_+ + 1)/4 + 1, \end{aligned}$$

and $n = n^e_+ = \lfloor (2p_+ + 2)(2p_+ + 3)/4 \rfloor \geq p_+(p_+ + 5/2) + 1$. We thus see that $p_+(p_+ + 5/2) \leq 3p_+(p_+ + 1)/4$, which implies $p_+ \leq -6$, also a contradiction.

In other words, have shown that (6.2) has no solutions if λ_+ is of type (a) and λ_- is of type (b) or (c).

Let us now consider the cases where λ_+ is of type (a) and λ_- is of type (d). We use the notation $\Sigma^d_- = \delta_1 + \delta_2 + \delta_4 + \cdots + \delta_{a_-}$, where $a_- = 2^{s+1} - 1$. Also recall that $\delta_- = 1$, and $p_- = 2^{s+2} - 1$ with $s \geq 0$ in case (d), and we will use the notation $r_- = 2^s - 1$.

Similar to the previous case (with λ_- is of type (c), and λ_+ of type (a)) we have for all $k > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{mult}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k) \\ =&\Delta(\tilde{h}_- * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Sigma^d_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - \tilde{h}_+(k) + \Delta(\tilde{h}_+)(k) - \delta_+\delta_1(k) \\ =&((\Delta(\tilde{h}_-) + \Delta(\delta_0)) * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Sigma^d_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - \tilde{h}_+(k) - \delta_+\delta_1(k) \\ =& - T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - T_{p_-+1}\tilde{h}_+(k) + \tilde{h}_+(k) - \Delta(\tilde{h}_+)(k) \\ &\qquad + \Sigma^d_-(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - \delta_+\delta_1(k) \\ =& - T_{p_-+1}\tilde{h}_+(k) + \tilde{h}_+(k) + S_{p_++1} + \Sigma^d_-(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) - T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) \\ &\qquad - \delta_+\delta_{p_-+1}(k) + (\delta_+ - 1)\delta_1(k) \end{aligned}$$

Like in the previous case, we conclude first of all that the right hand side of (6.2) needs to be of the form $d^{extra,\mathrm{III}}_{a,b}$, or $d^{extra,\mathrm{IV}}_{a,b}$ where a and b are such that one of the corresponding extraspecial parameters (m^e_-, m^e_+) equals $1/4$. Let us use the same notations as in the previous case. We again have $\{p^e_-, p^e_+\} = \{-1, p^e_{max}\}$ for some $p^e_{max} \in \mathbf{Z}_+$. We see that $p^e_{max} = p_- + p_+ + 1$. As before we need that $T(k) := \tilde{h}_+(k) + S_{p_++1} + \Sigma_-(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) -$

$T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - \delta_+\delta_{p_-+1}(k) + (\delta_+ - 1)\delta_1(k) = 0$ for all $k > p_- + 1$, from which we conclude that $p_+ < p_- + 1$ (because of the presence of the function S_{p_-+1}). As before, we need that $T(p_-) = -1$, implying that $p_+ = p_- - 1$ this time.

Hence in this situation we have $p_+^e = p_- + p_+ + 1 = 2p_-$. We have $n = n_- + n_+$ with $n_- = 8(r_- + 1)^2 = (p_- + 1)^2/2$, and $n_+ = \lfloor \kappa_+(2(\kappa_+ - 1) + 2\epsilon_+ - 1)/2 \rfloor = \lfloor (p_+ + 2 - \epsilon)(p_+ + 1 + \epsilon)/4 \rfloor = \lfloor p_-(p_- + 1)/4 \rfloor$, hence $n_+ \leq p_-(p_- + 1)/4$. Taken together we have

$$n \leq (p_- + 1)^2/2 + p_-(p_- + 1)/4 = (p_- + 1)(3p_- + 2)/4.$$

On the other hand, we have $n = n_+^e \geq p_-(p_- + 3/2)$. Hence we conclude that $p_-(p_- + 3/2) \leq (p_- + 1)(3p_- + 2)/4$, which implies that $p_-^2/4 + p_-/4 \leq 1/2$, hence $p_- \leq 1$. But then $p_+ \leq 0$, a contradiction.

Hence we have shown that (6.2) has no solutions for λ_+ of type (a) and λ_- of type (d).

Next let us consider the cases with λ_+ of type (a) and λ_- of type (e). We now have $r_- = 2^s - 1$ for some $s \geq 0$, and $a_- = 2(r_- + 1)$, $p_- = 2a_- = 2^{s+2} \geq 4$. Moreover, $\delta_- = 0$ now. We write $\Sigma_-^e = \delta_1 + \delta_2 + \delta_4 + \cdots + \delta_{p_-}$. Similar to the previous cases (with λ_- is of type (b), and λ_+ of type (a)) we have for all $k > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{mult}_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&\Delta(\tilde{h}_- * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Sigma_-^e(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - \tilde{h}_+(k)\\
=&(\Delta(\tilde{h}_-) * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Sigma_-^e(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - \tilde{h}_+(k)\\
=&-T_{p_-+1}\tilde{h}_+(k) + T_{p_-}\tilde{h}_+(k) - T_{p_--1}\tilde{h}_+(k)\\
&\qquad\qquad - T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) + T_{-p_-}\tilde{h}_+(k) - T_{-(p_--1)}\tilde{h}_+(k)\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad + \tilde{h}_+(k) + \Sigma_-^e(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k)
\end{aligned}$$

If we assume that $p_+ \geq 3$ then the maximum of the support of the sum S_6 of the first 6 terms (the translations of $\tilde{h}_+$, but not including the non translated term $\tilde{h}_+$) is $k = p_- + p_+ + 1$, and the maximum of the support of the remaining terms $T_R := \Sigma_-^e(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k)$ (excluding $\tilde{h}_+$) is equal to $p_- + 1$ (if $\delta_+ = 1$) or p_- (if $\delta_+ = 0$). Since $p_+ = 3$ corresponds to $\delta_+ = 0$, we see that $T_R = 0$ on $p_- + p_+ + 1$, $p_- + p_+$, $p_- + p_+ - 1$, $p_- + p_+ - 2$. The values of S_6 there are easily seen to be -1, 0, -2, -1 respectively. Since $\tilde{h}_+$ is also 0 at these arguments (since $p_- + p_+ - 2 > p_+$) these values are the multiplicities of the factors $(1 + q^k)$ in $\mu_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}$ for these values of k. If $\mathtt{r}$ is a solution of (6.2) we conclude that the right hand side d_{rhs} of (6.2) is of the form $d_{a,b}^{extra,\mathrm{III}}$, or $d_{a,b}^{extra,\mathrm{IV}}$ where a and b are such that one of the corresponding extraspecial parameters (m_-^e, m_+^e) equals $3/4$. Hence we now know d_{rhs} exactly in terms of p_- and p_+.

Now consider the behavior of $S_6 - d_{rhs}$ at the arguments $k = p_- + 1$, p_-, $p_- - 1$, $p_- - 2$. Looking at the three positively translated graphs of $\tilde{h}_+$ for all possible congruence classes of p_+ modulo 4, we see that these values are δ_+, $1 - \delta_+$, $1 + \delta_+$, 2 respectively, and the value of T_R at these arguments is $-\delta_+$, $\delta_+ - 1$, $-\delta_+ - 2$, $\Sigma_-^e(p_- - 2) - 4$. The sum of these gives the values 0, 0, -1, $\Sigma_-^e(p_- - 2) - 2$, and if we add $\tilde{h}_+$ to this we should get 0 everywhere. We conclude that $p_+ = p_- - 1$ and $p_- = 4$, otherwise this is not possible. However, then $p_+ = 3$ which corresponds to $\delta_+ = 0$, so that $(\delta_-, \delta_+) = (0,0)$. But $d_{rhs} = d_{a,b}^{extra,\mathrm{III}}$, with corresponding values $m_-^e = 3/4$ and $m_+^e = 9/4$, which yields $\delta_-^e = 1$ and $\delta_+^e = 0$. One checks that d_{rhs} is an extra special cuspidal unipotent degree for the symplectic group $\mathbf{PCSp}_{36}$, while the "solution" $\mathtt{r}$ of (6.2) is a residual point for $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{CO}_{28}^0)$, so this is not really a solution.

For $p_+ \leq 2$, the value $\tilde{h}_+(k)$ is zero at k equal to $p_- + p_+ + 1, \ldots, p_- - 1$. If $p_+ = 2$ we find that S_6 has the values -1, 0, -2, 0, -2 there, while $\delta_+ = 0$ and T_R has the values 0, 0, 0, -1, -2, which yields the total -1, 0, -2, -1, -4, which are not the multiplicities of a cuspidal unipotent formal degree, and for $p_+ = 1$ (with $\delta_+ = 1$) we get for these values of S_6 the sequence -1, 1, -2, 1 while for T_R we get 0, -1, 0, -3 which yields the total -1, 0, -2, -2, which is also not a sequence of multiplicities of a cuspidal unipotent formal degree. We may finally conclude that there are no solutions to (6.2) of the form $\mathtt{r}_{\lambda_-,\lambda_+}$ with λ_- of type (e) and λ_+ of type (a).

Next let us consider the cases with λ_- of type (b), (c) and λ_+ of type (d). This implies that $\delta_+ = 1$, and $p_+ \geq 3$. We compute in a similar way to the case where both $\lambda_\pm$ are of type (b) or (c):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{mult}_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&\Delta(\tilde{h}_- * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_+(k) + \Sigma_+^d(k) + \Delta_{\delta_-}(\tilde{h}_+)(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&((\Delta(\tilde{h}_-) + \Delta_{\delta_-}(\delta_0)) * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_+(k) + \Sigma_+^d(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - \delta_-\delta_1(k)\\
=&-T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - T_{+(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) + \Sigma_+^d(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) - \delta_{(p_-+1)}(k)\\
=&-(\max\{0, p_- + p_+ + 2 - k\} + \max\{0, |p_+ - p_-| - k\}) + R(k)
\end{aligned}$$

where we see that $R(k) = 0$ for $k > p_- + 1$, and $R(p_- + 1) > 0$.

This does not represent a cuspidal unipotent formal degree, and therefore there are no solutions of (6.2) with λ_- of type (b) or (c) and λ_+ of type (d).

Next let us consider the cases with λ_- of type (b), (c) and λ_+ of type (e). This implies that $\delta_+ = 0$, and $p_+ \geq 4$. We again compute in a similar way to the case where both $\lambda_\pm$ are of type (b) or (c):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{mult}_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}(k) - \delta_-\delta_+\delta_1(k)\\
=&\Delta(\tilde{h}_- * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta_{\delta_+}(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_+(k) + \Sigma_+^e(k) + \Delta_{\delta_-}(\tilde{h}_+)(k)\\
=&((\Delta(\tilde{h}_-) + \Delta_{\delta_-}(\delta_0)) * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_+(k) + \Sigma_+^e(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k)\\
=&-T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - T_{+(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) + \Sigma_+^e(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k)
\end{aligned}$$

We see that the values at k equal to $p_- + p_+ + 1$, $p_- + p_+$, $p_- + p_+ - 1$, $p_- + p_+ - 2$ are $-1, -1, -2, -3$. This does not represent a cuspidal unipotent formal degree, and therefore there are no solutions of (6.2) with λ_- of type (b) or (c) and λ_+ of type (e).

Next let us consider the cases with $\lambda_\pm$ both of type (d). This implies that $\delta_\pm = 1$, and $p_\pm \geq 3$. We may assume that $p_+ \leq p_-$ We again perform similar computations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{mult}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}(k) - \delta_1(k)\\
=&\Delta(\tilde{h}_- * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta(\tilde{h}_-)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_+(k) + \Sigma^d_+(k) + \Delta(\tilde{h}_+)(k) + \Sigma^d_-(k) - \delta_1(k)\\
=&((\Delta(\tilde{h}_-) + \Delta(\delta_0)) * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_+(k) + \Sigma^d_+(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Delta(\tilde{h}_-)(k) + \Sigma^d_-(k) - \delta_1(k)\\
=&-T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - T_{+(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) - \Delta(\tilde{h}_+)(k) + \Delta(\tilde{h}_-)(k) + \Sigma^d_+(k) + \Sigma^d_-(k)
\end{aligned}$$

If this is a solution of (6.2) then, looking at the values at the arguments $k = p_- + p_+ + 2$, $p_- + p_+ + 1$, $p_- + p_+$, $p_- + p_+ - 1$, we conclude that the right hand side d_{rhs} of (6.2) should be of the form $d^{ord,\mathrm{III}}_{a,b}$ or $d^{ord,\mathrm{IV}}_{a,b}$, because these values are $0, -1, -2, -3$. But at $k = p_- + 1$ the value of the above sum of terms is greater or equal to $1 - p_+ + 1 - 1 = 1 - p_+$, while the multiplicity function of d_{rhs} is less or equal to $-1 - p_+$. Hence there are no solutions $\mathtt{r}_{\lambda_-,\lambda_+}$ of (6.2) with $\lambda_\pm$ of type (d).

Next let us consider the cases with $\lambda_\pm$ both of type (e). This implies that $\delta_\pm = 0$, and $p_\pm \geq 4$. We may assume that $p_+ \leq p_-$ We again perform similar computations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{mult}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}(k)\\
=&\Delta(\tilde{h}_- * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) - 2\tilde{h}_+(k) + \Sigma^e_+(k) + \Sigma^e_-(k)\\
=&-T_{p_-+1}\tilde{h}_+(k) + T_{p_-}\tilde{h}_+(k) - T_{p_--1}\tilde{h}_+(k)\\
&\qquad - T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) + T_{-p_-}\tilde{h}_+(k) - T_{-(p_--1)}\tilde{h}_+(k)\\
&\qquad\qquad - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Sigma^e_+(k) + \Sigma^e_-(k)
\end{aligned}$$

This can not represent a solution of (6.2) since, looking at the values of this sum at the arguments $k = p_- + p_+ + 2$, $p_- + p_+ + 1$, $p_- + p_+$, $p_- + p_+ - 1$, $p_- + p_+ - 2$, we get $0, -1, -1, -2, -3$, which does not correspond to a cuspidal formal degree. Hence there is no solution $\mathtt{r}_{\lambda_-,\lambda_+}$ of (6.2) with $\lambda_\pm$ of type (e).

Finally, let us consider the cases with λ_- of type (d), and λ_+ of type (e). This implies that $\delta_- = 1$, $p_- \geq 3$, and $\delta_+ = 0$, $p_+ \geq 4$. We again perform similar computations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{mult}^{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}_{(\delta_-,\delta_+)}(k)\\
=&\Delta(\tilde{h}_- * \tilde{h}_+)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) + \Sigma^d_-(k) - 2\tilde{h}_+(k) + \Sigma^e_+(k) + \Delta(\tilde{h}_+)(k)\\
=&\big((\Delta(\tilde{h}_-) + \Delta(\delta_0)) * \tilde{h}_+\big)(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) - 2\tilde{h}_+(k) + \Sigma^e_+(k) + \Sigma^d_-(k)\\
=&-T_{-(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - T_{+(p_-+1)}\tilde{h}_+(k) - 2\tilde{h}_-(k) - \Delta(\tilde{h}_+)(k) + \Sigma^e_+(k) + \Sigma^d_-(k)
\end{aligned}$$

If $p_- > 3$, this can not represent a solution of (6.2) since in this case, looking at the values of this sum at the arguments $k = p_- + p_+ + 2$, $p_- + p_+ + 1$, $p_- + p_+$, $p_- + p_+ - 1$, $p_- + p_+ - 2$, we get $0, -1, -1, -2, -3$, which does not correspond to a cuspidal formal degree. If $p_- = 3$ the values of the sum on $k = p_+ + 5$, $p_+ + 4$, $p_+ + 3$, $p_+ + 2$, $p_+ + 1, p_+$ are as follows $0, -1, -1, -2, -2, -4$, which also does not correspond to a cuspidal unipotent formal degree. Hence there is no solution $\mathtt{r}_{\lambda_-,\lambda_+}$ of (6.2) with λ_- of type (d) and λ_+ of type (e) either.

We have finally checked all possibilities, which completes the proof of Theorem 1.6(a),(b) for symplectic and even orthogonal groups. Together with the results of Subsection 6.4 and Subsection 6.5 we have now finally completed the proof of Theorem 1.6(a),(b).

6.6.2. *Proof of Theorem 1.6(c), (d).* Recall that we are considering G_{qs} of type $\mathbf{PCSp}_{2n}$ (type III), $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{CO}^0_{2n})$ or $\mathbf{P}((\mathbf{CO}^*_{2n+2})^0)$ (these two of type IV). Recall also that θ denotes the diagram automorphism induced by the action of the Frobenius element on G. The spectral covering maps $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{IM}}(G_{\mathrm{qs}}) \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{C}_n(\delta_-,\delta_+)[q]$ with $(\delta_-,\delta_+)=(0,1)$, $(0,0)$, $(1,1)$ are given by degree two coverings in the first two cases, and is an isomorphism in the last case.

For $G=\mathbf{PCSp}_{2n}$, the group $\Omega=\Omega_{ad}$ is equal to $C_2=\{1,\rho\}$ and $\theta=1$. For $G=\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{CO}^0_{2n})$ we use the notation $\Omega=\{1,\rho,\eta,\eta\rho\}$, which is isomorphic to $C_2\times C_2$ if n is even, and to C_4 of n is odd. For this split group we obviously have $\theta=1$. For $G=\mathbf{P}((\mathbf{CO}^*_{2n+2})^0)$, θ is the nontrivial finite type D_n subdiagram automorphism of order two. We take η and ρ such that: η is θ-invariant, and $[\rho,\theta]=[\rho\eta,\theta]=\eta$. Then $\rho^2=1$ if n is even, and $\rho^2=\eta$ is n is odd. Thus for $G=\mathbf{P}((\mathbf{CO}^*_{2n+2})^0)$ we have $\Omega^\theta=\{1,\eta\}$ and $\Omega/(1-\theta)\Omega=\{1,\overline{\rho}\}$.

Remark 6.5. *Let* $\Omega^*=\{1,\epsilon,\gamma,\epsilon\gamma\}$ *be the dual group of* $\Omega=\{1,\rho,\eta,\eta\rho\}$, *where* $\epsilon(\rho)=i^n$, $\epsilon(\eta)=-1$, *and* $\gamma(\rho)=-1$ *and* $\gamma(\eta)=1$. *Then the relevant groups of spectral diagram automorphisms* $\Gamma_{spec}=(\Omega^\theta_{ad})^*$ *are given by:* $C_2=\{1,\gamma\}$ *for* $G=\mathbf{PCSp}_{2n}$; $\{1,\epsilon,\gamma,\epsilon\gamma\}$ *for* $G=\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{CO}^0_{2n})$ *(where for n even we have $\epsilon^2=1$, and for n odd we have $\epsilon^2=\gamma$); and* $C_2=\{1,\gamma\}$ *for* $G=\mathbf{P}((\mathbf{CO}^*_{2n+2})^0)$.

As discussed above, we may associate a unique unramified discrete local Langlands parameter $[\lambda_{ad}]$ to a pair (λ_-,λ_+), via the correspondence discussed in Remark 1.10 and above in Subsection 6.4.

Given a type $\mathcal{X}\in\{\mathrm{III},\mathrm{IV},\mathrm{V},\mathrm{IV}\}$ and a pair of nonnegative integers $\{a,b\}$ (subject to requirements we will make explicitly below) we can associate a conjugacy class of maximal parahoric subgroups $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{X}}_{a,b}$ of a well defined inner form G^u of G_{qs} (with $u\in H^1(k,G)\simeq\Omega/(1-\theta)\Omega$) supporting a cuspidal unipotent character. The conjugacy classes of such maximal parahoric subgroups $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{X}}_{a,b}$ of G_{qs} are represented by the diagram of an apartment of the building of $G=\mathbf{G}(K)$, with a maximal proper subdiagram of boxed vertices which forms the complement of a $\theta.u$-orbit, where the boxed subdiagram (with Frobenius acting via $\theta.u$) is the root diagram of a finite group of Lie type supporting a cuspidal unipotent character.

(i) Firstly look at $G=\mathbf{PCSp}_{2n}$ (here $n\geq 2$). In this case, for $u=1$, the parahoric subgroup $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{III}}_{a,b}$ corrsponds to a maximal proper subdiagram of the affine Dynkin diagram of G_{qs} with two (possibly empty) components, of type C_{a^2+a} and type C_{b^2+b}. We define $\{m_-,m_+\}$ by $\{1+2a,1+2b\}=\{m_++m_-,|m_+-m_-|\}$ and obtain via Theorem 1.6(b) the corresponding residue point $\mathtt{r}:=\mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}$, where λ_- is of type Corollary 5.14(b) and λ_+ is of type Corollary 5.14(c). We see that $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}}=C_2$ unless $m_-=0$, in which case $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}}=1$. On the other hand, we have $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}}=1$ unless $a=b$, in which case

$\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}} = C_2$. This proves the desired result for $u = 1$.

Next, assume that we take unipotent cuspidal pairs of the inner form defined $u = \rho$. Then we are considering $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{V}}_{a,b}$, of type [3] $\mathrm{C}_{b^2+b}[q^2]$ and a component of type ${}^2\mathrm{A}_{(a^2+a)/2-1}(q^2)$. This determines $m_\pm$ by the rule $\{1/2+a, 1+2b\} = \{m_+ + m_-, |m_+ - m_-|\}$. We obtain a residual point $\mathtt{r} = \mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}$ where $\lambda_\pm$ are both of type Corollary 5.14(a), of length $l_\pm := \kappa_\pm$. Observe that if $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{V}}_{a,b}$ supports a cuspidal character then clearly $n > 2$, hence $|\lambda_-| + |\lambda_+| \geq 7$, and $l_- + l_+ \geq 3$ (the smallest solution is $n = 3$, with $\lambda_- = [1, 5]$ and $\lambda_+ = [1]$).

Here we always have $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}} = \Omega^\theta = C_2 = \{1, \rho\}$, hence we have two such cuspidal characters. On the other hand, $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = C_2$ unless $m_- = 1/4$ (which holds if and only if λ_- is the zero partition, in this situation). If $\lambda_- \neq 0$, the centralizer group $A_{[\lambda_{ad}]}$ is a group[4] of type $2^{(l_-+l_+-3)+2}$, according to [Op3, Proposition 4.8]. Hence if $\lambda_- \neq 0$, there are two representations of $A_{[\lambda_{ad}]}$ of dimension $2^{(l_-+l_+-3)/2}$ which restrict to ρ times the identity on ${}^LZ \simeq (\Omega/(1-\theta)\Omega)^*$, and these two "extra special" cuspidal local systems correspond to the two cuspidal characters. But if $\lambda_- = 0$, we have $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = 1$.

Now $A_{[\lambda_{ad}]}$ is a group of type $2^{(l_+-1)+1}$, which has one representation of dimension $2^{(l_+-1)/2}$ which corresponds to a cuspidal local system. We then have two Langlands parameters $[\lambda_{ad}]$ and $[\lambda'_{ad}]$ over $[\lambda_{sc}]$ (a single $(\Omega^\theta)^*$-orbit), each of which accommodates one of the two cuspidal characters. This completes the proof for $G = \mathbf{PCSp}_{2n}$.

(ii) Now we turn to consider the split group $G = \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{CO}^0_{2n})$, with $n \geq 4$. In this case we have $\Omega^\theta = \Omega = \Omega/(1-\theta)\Omega$ because of splitness.

First we consider $u = 1$. Then the subdiagram of the affine Dynkin diagram of G_{qs} corresponding to $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{IV}}_{a,b}$ is a maximal proper subdiagram with two (possibly empty) components, of type D_{a^2} and type D_{b^2}, with $a, b \in 2\mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Hence $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}}$ equals C_2, except when $a = 0$ or $b = 0$ in which case $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}} = 1$, or when $a = b$, in which case $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}} = C_2 \times C_2$ (this last case can occur only if n is even). We define $\{m_-, m_+\}$ by $\{2a, 2b\} = \{m_+ + m_-, |m_+ - m_-|\}$ and obtain via Theorem 1.6(b) the corresponding residue point $\mathtt{r} := \mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}$, where $\lambda_\pm$ is of type Corollary 5.14(b). We see that $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = C_2$ unless $m_- = 0$, in which case $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = 1$, or $m_- = m_+$, in which case $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = \Omega^*$. Hence in all these cases we have the equality $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = (\Omega^\theta/\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}})^*$. Also, in each such case $A_{[\lambda_{ad}]}$ has one cuspidal local system (corresponding to a pair of Lusztig-Shoji symbols each with one empty row). This proves the result for $u = 1$.

Now consider the inner form determined by $u = \eta$. We are considering $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{IV}}_{a,b}$ whose corresponding subdiagram of the affine Dynkin diagram of G_{qs} is a maximal proper subdiagram with two (possibly empty) components, of type D_{a^2} and type D_{b^2}, with $a, b \in 2\mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0} + 1$. Hence $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}}$ equals C_2, except when $a = b$, in which case $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}} = C_2 \times C_2$ (indeed, this can occur only if n is even). We define $\{m_-, m_+\}$ by $\{2a, 2b\} = \{m_+ + m_-, |m_+ - m_-|\}$ and obtain via Theorem 1.6(b) the corresponding residue point $\mathtt{r} := \mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}$, where $\lambda_\pm$ is of type Corollary 5.14(b). We see that $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = C_2$ unless $m_- = 0$, in which case $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = 1$. Hence in all these cases we also have the equality $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = (\Omega^\theta/\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}})^*$. Again, in each such case $A_{[\lambda_{ad}]}$ has one cuspidal local system (corresponding to a pair of Lusztig-Shoji symbols in the sense of Slooten [Slo] each with one empty row). This proves the result for $u = \eta$.

---

[3] By a group of type $\mathrm{C}_{b^2+b}[q^2]$ we mean the restriction of scalars group defined over $\mathbf{F_q}$, whose group of $\mathbf{F_q}$-points is the group $\mathrm{Sp}_{2(b^2+b)}(\mathbf{F_{q^2}})$. The boxed subdiagram of this group consists of two isomorphic components which are interchanged by ρ.

[4] Here we use the **notation** $2^{(2a)+b}$ (cf. [Op3, Proposition 4.8]) to indicate an extra special 2-group of cardinality 2^{2a+b}, with 2^{2a+b-1} representations of dimension 1, and 2^{b-1} irreducible representations of dimension 2^a.

Finally, let us consider the inner forms with $u = \rho$ or $u = \eta\rho$ (the extra special cases). We treat $u = \rho$ (the case $u = \rho\eta$ gives completely similar results). Then we are considering $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{VI}}_{a,b}$, with one (possibly empty) component of type[5] $\mathrm{D}_{b^2}[q^2]$ and a (possibly empty) component of type ${}^2\mathrm{A}_{(a^2+a)/2-1}(q^2)$. Then $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}}$ equals Ω, unless n is even and $b = 0$, in which case $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}} = \{1, \eta\} = C_2$.

We define $\{m_-, m_+\}$ by $\{1/2 + a, 2b\} = \{m_+ + m_-, |m_+ - m_-|\}$. Observe that there are in total $n + 1$ nodes in the affine Dynkin diagram of $G = \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{CO}^0_{2n})$. In order to obtain the rank 0 affine Hecke algebra, we choose $n - 1$ nodes by taking two type $\mathrm{D}_{b^2}[q^2]$ components and one type ${}^2\mathrm{A}_{(a^2+a)/2-1}(q^2)$ component. Thus $n - 1 = 2b^2 + (a^2 + a)/2 - 1$. Recall that for n even, we have b even and hence $a \equiv 0, 3 \pmod 4$; while for n odd, we have b odd and hence $a \equiv 1, 2 \pmod 4$. This implies that $\kappa_\pm \in 2\mathbf{Z}$.

We obtain via Theorem 1.6(b) the corresponding residue point $\mathtt{r} := \mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}$, where $\lambda_\pm$ is of type Corollary 5.14(a). Recall that the length $l_\pm$ of the partition $\lambda_\pm$ equals $\kappa_\pm$, hence the lengths $l_\pm$ are both *even*. We see that $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = C_2$ except when $m_- = 1/4$ (which is equivalent to $\lambda_- = 0$), in which case $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = 1$, or when $m_- = m_+$, in which case $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = \Omega^*$.

If $\lambda_- = 0$ then $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{VI}}_{a,b}} = \Omega$. We have 4 W_0-orbits of Langlands parameters $[\lambda_{ad}]$ above λ_{sc}, which form 1 Ω^*-orbit. In this case, $A_{[\lambda_{ad}]}$ is of type $2^{(l_+-2)+2}$, which carries 1 cuspidal local systems restricting to ρ times the identity on ${}^LZ \simeq \Omega^*$ (and also one which restricts to $\rho\eta$ times the identity). Together these correspond to the 4 cuspidal characters of this type. Indeed, the number of cuspidal characters supported by $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{VI}}_{a,b}$ equals 4 (one orbit under $(\Omega^\theta)^* = \Omega^*$).

If $\lambda_- \neq 0$, and $m_- \neq m_+$, then $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{VI}}_{a,b}} = \Omega$ and we again have 4 cuspidal characters with the same formal degree of this inner form. By Theorem 1.6(b), they correspond to two W_0-orbits $W_0\mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}$ and $W_0\mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_+,\lambda_-)}$, where $\lambda_- \neq \lambda_+$. Now [Op3, Proposition 4.14] implies that $A_{[\lambda_{ad}]}$ is of type $2^{(l_-+l_+-4)+3}$, and each orbit of Langlands parameters carries 2 cuspidal local systems which restrict to ρ times the identity on ${}^LZ$.

Last, if $m_- = m_+$ then n is even, and $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{VI}}_{a,b}} = C_2$, and $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{VI}}_{a,b}$ carries 2 cuspidal characters in this case. On the other hand, now $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = \Omega^*$, and we have one orbit of

---

[5] By a group of type $\mathrm{D}_{b^2}[q^2]$ we mean the restriction of scalars group defined over $\mathbf{F}_q$, whose group of $\mathbf{F}_q$-points is the group $\mathbf{SO}_{2b^2}(\mathbf{F}_{q^2})$ if n is even or $\mathbf{SO}^*_{2b^2}(\mathbf{F}_{q^2})$ if n is odd. The boxed subdiagram of this group consists of two isomorphic components which are interchanged by ρ.

Langlands parameter $[\lambda_{ad}]$ with $A_{[\lambda_{ad}]}$ of type $2^{(2l_+-4)+3}$. This has 2 irreducible representations which restrict to ρ times the identity on ${}^LZ$.

This finishes the proof for $G = \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{CO}^0_{2n})$.

(iii) Finally consider $G = \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{CO}^*)^0_{2n+2}$, with $n \geq 3$. We have $\Omega^\theta = \{1, \eta\}$, $(\Omega^\theta)^* = \{1, \overline{\epsilon}\}$, and $\Omega/(1-\theta)\Omega = \{1, \overline{\rho}\}$.

We start with $u = 1$. The parahoric subgroup $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{IV}}_{a,b}$ corresponds to a maximal proper subdiagram of the affine Dynkin diagram of G_{qs} consisting with two (possibly empty) components, of type D_{a^2} and type D_{b^2}, where the integers a is even and b is odd, such that $a^2+b^2 = n+1$. Hence $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}}$ equals C_2, except when $a = 0$ in which case $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}} = 1$. We define $\{m_-, m_+\}$ by $\{2a, 2b\} = \{m_+ + m_-, |m_+ - m_-|\}$ and obtain via Theorem 1.6(b) the corresponding residue point $\mathtt{r} := \mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}$, where $\lambda_\pm$ is of type Corollary 5.14(b). We see that $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = 1$ unless $m_- = m_+$, in which case $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = C_2$. In all these cases we have the equality $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = (\Omega^\theta/\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}})^*$. Also, in each such case $A_{[\lambda_{ad}]}$ has one cuspidal local system (corresponding to a pair of Lusztig-Shoji symbols each with one empty row). This proves the result for $u = 1$.

Now consider the inner form with $u = \overline{\rho}$ (the extra special cases). Then we are considering $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{VI}}_{a,b}$, maximal proper with one (possibly empty) component of type $\mathrm{D}_{b^2}[q^2]$ and one (possibly empty) component of type ${}^2\mathrm{A}_{(a/2)(a+1)-1}(q^2)$. The group $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}}$ equals $\Omega^\theta = \langle\eta\rangle$ of order two; unless n is even and $b = 0$, in which case $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}} = 1$.

We define $\{m_-, m_+\}$ by $\{1/2 + a, 2b\} = \{m_+ + m_-, |m_+ - m_-|\}$. This time there are in total $n+2$ nodes in the affine Dynkin diagram of $G = \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{CO}^*)^0_{2n+2}$. Thus this time we see that $\kappa_\pm$ are always odd. Via Theorem 1.6(b) we obtain the corresponding residue point $\mathtt{r} := \mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}$, where $\lambda_\pm$ are of type (a) in Corollary 5.14, both of odd length $l_\pm$. Also, $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = 1$, except when $m_- = m_+$, where $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} \simeq C_2$. Therefore, we see that the index $[(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} : (\Omega^\theta/\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}_{a,b}})^*] = 1$ in all cases.

If $m_- \neq m_+$, then $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{VI}}_{a,b}} = \langle\eta\rangle$ is of order two, and there are two cuspidal characters with the same formal degree of this inner form. By Theorem 1.6(b) these correspond to $W_0\mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_-,\lambda_+)}$ and $W_0\mathtt{r}_{(\lambda_+,\lambda_-)}$, with $\lambda_- \neq \lambda_+$. Now $A_{[\lambda_{ad}]}$ is of type $2^{(l_-+l_+-2)+1}$, hence both these orbits of Langlands parameters carry one cuspidal local system which restricts to $\overline{\rho}$ times the identity on ${}^LZ$.

If $m_- = m_+$ then n is even, and $\Omega^{\theta,\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{VI}}_{a,b}}$ is trivial. Hence $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{VI}}_{a,b}$ carries one cuspidal character in this case. On the other hand, $(\Omega^\theta)^*_{W_0\mathtt{r}} = (\Omega^\theta)^*$, and there is one orbit of Langlands parameter $[\lambda_{ad}]$ with $A_{[\lambda_{ad}]}$ of type $2^{(2l_+-2)+1}$. This again has one irreducible representation which restrict to $\overline{\rho}$ times the identity on ${}^LZ$. This finishes the discussion for $u = \bar{\rho}$, and hence finishes the proof of the result for $G = \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{CO}^*)^0_{2n+2}$.

We thus completed the proof of Theorem 1.6, finally, completely. □

References

[Bo] Borel, A. "Automorphic L-functions", Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, Vol. **33** (1979), part 2, pp. 27–61.

[BT] Bruhat, F. , Tits, J. , "Groupes réductifs sur un corps local. II. Schémas en groupes. Existence d'une donnée radicielle valuée", *Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci. Publ. Math.*, No. **60** (1984), pp. 197–376.

[BKH] Bushnell, C.J., Henniart, G., Kutzko, P.C., "Types and Explicit Plancherel Formulae for Reductive p-adic groups", in *On certain L-functions*, 55–80, Clay Math. Proc., **13**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011.

[Car] Carter, Roger W. , " Finite groups of Lie type *Conjugacy classes and complex characters*" John Wiley and Sons, 1985

[CK] Ciubotary, D. , Kato, S. , "Tempered modules in exotic Deligne-Langlands correspondence", Advances in Mathematics, **226** (2011) pp. 1538–1590

[DeRe] DeBacker, S. , Reeder, M. , "Depth-zero supercuspidal L-packets and theri stability" Annals of Mathematics, **169** (2009), 795–901

[Fe1] Feng, Y., "On Cuspidal Unipotent Representations", Thesis 2015, University of Amsterdam.

[Fe2] Feng, Y., "Notes on Spectral Transfer Maps for Affine Hecke Algebras", in preparation.

[GR] Gross, B. , Reeder, M. , "Arithmetic invariants of discrete Langlands parameters", *Duke Math. J.* **154** (2010), no. 3, 431-508.

[PR] Pappas, G., Rapoport, M., "Twisted loop groups and their affine flag varieties". With an appendix by Haines, T. , Rapoport, M. , *Adv. Math.* **219** (2008), no. 1, 118–198

[HO] Heckman, G. J., Opdam, E. M. , "Yang's system of particles and Hecke algebras", *Annals of Math.* **145**, 1997, 139–173

[HII] Hiraga, K. , Ichino, A. , Ikeda, T. , "Formal degrees and adjoint gamma factors (and errata)", *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **21** (2008), no. 1, 283-304.

[Kac] Kac, V.G. , *Infinite dimensional Lie algebras*, Third Edition, Cambridge University Press, (1994)

[Kot] Kottwitz, R.E., "Stable trace formula: elliptic singular terms", Math. Ann., **275** (1986), 365–399.

[Kot1] Kottwitz, R.E., "Isocrystals with additional structure. II", Compositio Mathematica **109** (1997), 255–339.

[Lus] Lusztig, G. , "Characters of reductive groups over a finite field", Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. **107**, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1984.

[Lus1] Lusztig, G. "Classification of Unipotent Representations of Simple p-adic groups", *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* **11** (1995), 517–589.

[Lus2] Lusztig, G., "Classification of unipotent representations of simple p-adic groups. II", *Represent. Theory*, **6** (2002), 243–289.

[Mo] Morris, L., "Level zero G-types", *Compositio Math.* **118**(2) (1999), 135–157.

[Op1] Opdam, E. M. , "On the spectral decompostion of affine Hecke algebras", Journal of the Inst. of Math. Jussieu (2004) **3**(4), 531–648

[Op2] Opdam, E. M. , "Spectral correspondences for affine Hecke algebras", Advances in Mathematics **286** (2016), 912–957.

[Op3] Opdam, E. M. , "Spectral transfer morphisms for unipotent affine Hecke algebras", To appear in Selecta Mathematica (2016), and math.RT.1310.7790 (2013).

[OS] Opdam, E. M. , Solleveld M. , "Discrete series characters for affine Hecke algebras and their formal degrees", Acta Mathematica, September 2010, Volume 205, Issue 1, pp 105–187.

[R1] M. Reeder, "On the Iwahori spherical discrete series of p-adic Chevalley groups; formal degrees and L-packets", Ann. Sci. Ec. Norm. Sup. **27** (1994), pp 463–491.

[R2] Reeder, M., "Formal degrees and L-packets of unipotent discrete series of exceptional p-adic groups", with an appendix by Frank Lübeck, *J. reine angew. Math.* **520** (2000), 37–93.

[R3] Reeder, M. , "Torsion automorphisms of simple Lie algebras", L'Enseignement Mathematique (2), 56, (2010), pages 3–47.

[Slo] Slooten, K. , "Generalized Springer correspondence and Green functions for type B/C graded Hecke algebras", *Advances in Mathematics* **203** (2006), 34–108.

[Spr] Springer, T. A. , *Linear Algebraic Groups*, Progress in Mathematics **9**, Birkhäuser (1998).

[Tits] Tits, J. "Reductive groups over local fields", Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, Vol. **33** (1979), part 1, pp. 29–69.

[Vog] Vogan, D. "The local Langlands conjecture", Representation theory of groups and algebras, Contemp. Math. **145**, AMS, Providence, RI, 1993, 305–379.

(Y. Feng) INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, ASTROPHYSICS AND PARTICLE PHYSICS, RADBOUD UNIVERSITEIT NIJMEGEN, HEYENDAALSEWEG 135, 6525 AJ NIJMEGEN, THE NETHERLANDS
E-mail address: `yongqifeng@science.ru.nl`

(E. Opdam) KORTEWEG-DE VRIES INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITEIT VAN AMSTERDAM, SCIENCE PARK 105-107, 1098 XG AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS
E-mail address: `e.m.opdam@uva.nl`